

# Iranian Political Ration and Kurdish Identity Search



Written by: Dr. Heresh Qaderi

Translated into English by: Dr. Jabbar Mirani

<b>Contents</b>	<b>page</b>
Translator's Preface	1
Introduction	3
 <b>Part One: Theoretical and Historical Foundations</b>	
 Chapter One: Ration and Politics	
Introduction	20
Rational policy	23
Political ration	25
Pre-Rationality Era	43
 Chapter Two: From Gutian to Khoramdinan	
Introduction	53
The difficulties of writing Kurd history	53
Medes: Natives or Aryans?	56
From Gutian to Median	60
From Median to Kurdish	61
From Gutian and Kardokhi to Kurdish	62
Gaumata and Ferawartish being Kurd	64
Mazdak and Mazdakian being Kurd	68
Kurdish Minor Mede or Turkish Azerbaijan?	71
The genealogy of the word Azerbaijan	72
Kurdish Minor Mede	77
Kurd being of Rawadians	84
Kurd being of Shadadians	89
The General Name of Kurdistan	91
Abu Muslim and Khoramdinan	92
Kurd being of Abu Muslim	93
Kurd being of Babak and Khoramdinan	94
Human Geography of Babak and Khoramdinan	95
Race and nationality of Khoramdinan	96

## **Part II: Development, consolidation and formulation of Iranian/Persian Political Rationality in opposition to Kurd identity**

### **Chapter Three: The Development of Iran's Political Rationality against Median Identityseeking**

Introduction	101
Mede, Pars: Interaction or Conflict?	103
The history of Medes	103
The sunrise of the Achaemenid Persians and the sunset of the Kurdish Medians	103
Cyrus from myth to reality	104
Peaceful transfer of power or conquer and plunder of Medes	112
The common domination of Medes and Pars or domination of Pars on Mede?	114
Negation of Medes and Pars kinship	115
The Negation of the Median being of Cyrus	118
2. The social order of Iran in contrast to the social order of Kurd (class justice in contrast to equality justice	120
Gutian and Manaians	120
The social order of the Medes	122
The Achaemenid/Pars Social Order	126
3. The Median government against the Iranian government: the contract against the divine right of the king	129
Median government	129
Iranian government	133
Iranian monarchy: the continuation of the Mesopotamian pattern, not the Median	138
4. Iranian religion in opposition to Median rite: Zoroaster's sunrise, Mithra's sunset	141
Median ritual: Mithra (Mehr)	141
Median being of Mithra	141
Mithra: the contract or the sun	146
Mithra: god of the sun/sky/ or god of darkness/Hades?	154
Mithra: bull and eagle or snake and lion?	161
Mithra: Spiritual/divine or terrestrial/physical ritual?	165
Mithra: Ba'gh (Garden) or Bagh, Pardis (paradise) or Ferdows	169
Mithra/Mehr: Autumn or Spring, Nowroz or Mehragan?	173
Iranian religion: Zoroastrianism	178
The time of Zoroaster	178
The Philosophy of the advent of Zoroaster and the demonization of Mithra	179
Deoes Mazen: (Mazandaran's demons) and Medes	183
Vandidad demons and Medes	186
Zoroaster's dualism against the Medes	189
Zoroastrianism: a Classical and Political Religion	196
Zoroastrianism of the Achaemenids in contrast to Mithraism of the Medians	200
Making Mithra as Zoroastrian/Persian	205

Intracontentual Transformation of Mithra and the Construction of Zoroastrian Mithra (a model for the construction of the Iranian Kurd)	206
5. Iranian Symbols versus Median Symbols	211
Median/Kurdish Symbols: the Lion and the Snake	211
The Lion	211
The Snake	212
Ancient Achaemenids/Persian Traces and Symbols	212
Pasargadae and Inscription of Bistoun	213
Persian language	213
The Bull	214
The Eagle	215
6. Medes in the Iranian Mythology, Ahriman (Devil), Ajidahak (Dragon) and Turanians	217
Philosophy of Creation: Ahuramazda (God) and Ahriman (Devil)	218
The Man and the Woman	219
Jamshid, Zahak and Fereydoun	222
Jamshid and his Sin	222
Zahak/Ajidahak	227
Median being of Zahak and Cyrus being of Fereydoun	228
Zahak beyond the good and evil of Iran and Kave-Harpag	229
Afrasiab and Turanians	243
Eastern becoming of Turanians in mythology	244
Keykhosrow/Cyrus and Turan/Mede	246
 Chapter Four: The Establishment of Iran Political ration against the Rebellion for the Median Identity (Darius and Gaumata)	
Introduction	252
Who is Gaumata?	253
The nature of the Gaumata's Uprising	256
1- Gaumata's Medianism and Daruis' Persianism	258
Gaumata's Medianism	258
Daruis' Persianism versus Medes	261
2- Darius' Class Justice against the Socialist Equality of Gaumata	264
3- The Metaphysical Ligitimacy of the Iranian Daruis versus the Popular Ligitimacy of the Median	

Gaumata: Devine Right versus Social Contract	267
4- Religious struggle: Zoroaster versus Mithra	270
Maguses, their religion and ethnicity	270
- Ferawartish and Chisertokhma	283
5- The Medes in Iranian mythology: Arjasip, Rostam and Isfandiyar	285
Kianian and Achaemenids	285
Rostam and Isfandiar and Ferdowsi's deadend	393
Rostam, Iranian or Aniranian?	294
Isfandiyar: the Truth or the Power	306
 Chapter Five: The development of the Political ration of Iran in Contrast to the Kurd's Uprising	
Introduction	309
Surveying the sources on Mazdak and developping the Iranian historiography	309
Mazdak uprising	313
1- Socialist Justice of Mazdak against Cosmic Justice of Anoshirvan	316
Mazdak's Modern Political Thought in Pre-modern Time	318
Socialism based on Mazdak's individualism	320
Anoshirvan's Cosmic Justice and Negation of Individual's Equality	322
2- The monopoly of Anoshirvan pleasure against equality pleasure of Mazdak (Zoroaster's celestial paradise versus Mithra's earthly (terrestrial) paradise)	326
Anoshirvan reaction	328
3- The religious struggle of Anoshirvan against Mazdak: Zoroaster versus Mithra	330
Anoshirvan's Zoroastrianism against Mazdak's Mithraism	332
4- Civil Status versus Natural Situation: Mithra/Contract against Domination of the Divine Right of the Kings	334
A Contemplation on the Ideas of Mazdak	338
 Chapter Six: Iran Land, Iranian Government and Pattern of Iranian Ration	
The genealogy of two words of Iranvij and Kurd	342
Greater Iran (Iran Land)	342
Kurd becoming of the Medes	344
 <b>A design for the theory of Government in the Middle East</b>	
Comparing the appearance (form) of three Iranian/Zoroastrian, Arabic/Islamic governments and the Kurdish/Mithraian government	353

Introduction	353
The Iranian/Zoroastrian government/empire	356
The development of the modern one-ethnicity state	360
Islamic/Arabic Government/Empire	366
Median/Mithraian Government/Contract	371
Conclusion	376
The Pattern of Iranian Wisdom and “the other” of it	379
The Confiscation of the Median Culture	380

### **Part III: The Development of History and Historical Ethnic Groups in Contrast to Kurd**

#### **Chapter Seven: The Opposition of Greek-Semitic Wisdom to Mithraian Kurds**

Introduction	385
Greek Reason: Apollo/Dionysus	385
Plato and Mithra	387
Perseus and Medusa	390
Greek Tragedy and Kurdish Mithra	391
Messia/Augustine and Mithra	393
Heraclitus/Stoics and Mithra	395
Stoics	395
The Sophists and the Revolt of Socrate/Plato	396
Epicure and the Fate of Death	397
Semitic political ration	399
Al-Hazar (Atra or Hatra)	400
Zolqarnain, Gog and Magog	402
Islam	405

#### **Chapter Eight: Kurd and History: History is the Split in the Continuation of Kurd-Mithra**

Introduction	408
Did Kurd become Kerol or Kermol?	409
God/History and Mithra/Satan	412
Apocalypse (end times) and the Re-emergence of Dajal (Imposter)/Mithra	414
Iranology, the science of history and historiography of Kurd	418
The Historiography of Kurd	426
A General Classification of the Kurd history based on the concept of Mithra	429
Conclusion	433

### **Pictures**

Notes of Chapter One	463
Notes of Chapter Two	464
Notes of Chapter Three	477
Notes of Chapter Four	491

Notes of Chapter Five	493
Notes of Chapter Six	494
References	496

**With love for my father and mother  
whose hairs got grey for the sake of our  
greatness and for the martyrs of  
Kurdistan ...**



Iranian Political Rationality and Kurd's Quest for  
Identity

**Written by: Dr. Heresh Qaderi**

Translated into English by: Dr. Jabbar Mirani

**With love for my father and mother  
whose hairs got grey for the sake of us  
and for the martyrs of Kurdistan ...**

Translator's Preface This book is revolutionary in nature, it will certainly change our knowledge system about many things that we have assumed as common sense truth especially with regard to the history, the history of Iran, the Middle east and the nature of Kurds' quest for identity. I learned many things from reading it which was originally written in Persian language; therefore, I decided to translate it into English so as to be accessible to a wider arena of the readers and researchers all over the world. I am sure you will enjoy learning new things while reading it.

It is necessary to state here that I have intentionally used the words "rationality", "ration", "wisdom", "reason", and "intellect" more often in the phrase "Iranian Political rationality" interchangeably for the translation of the word "aghl" in the Persian phrase of "Aghl-e siyasi-ye irani" as to add variation or variety to the content and to lessen the prosaic repetition of the word in the text.

## Introduction:

The subject of the current book is the kind of research that should have been presented a century ago involving criticizing the domination of another nation, rethinking self-identity and our (Kurds) self-concepts, and criticizing and falsifying “the other. Unfortunately, instead of researching the identity and Kurdish concepts, and criticizing the domination of other nation and counter-concepts, we are now facing with ideological nationalists, leftists, Salafists (Islamic fundamentalists), Orientalists, ethicists, and ... readings in this regard. Therefore, this research requires the ignorance of all existing perspectives and it presents a new attitude based on first-hand resources with a philosophical reading of the origins of concepts and counterconcepts. Putting aside its political / ethnic origins, this research is rooted in the vacuum as the vacuum is the foundation of all ambitions. Therefore, instead of presenting the foundation of crises, we should talk about the crisis of foundations.

One hundred years ago have passed since the contemporary Kurdish movements under the title of modern nationalism initiated, but the first step of any movement, that is, criticism has not been formed along with these nationalistic movements yet. The requirement for every movement is the theory and identity-construction, while the Kurdish contemporary movements are blind revolts lacking any rationality and identity rethinking. Therefore, the main issue of this book is theory and practice. In order not to be taken away by the contemporary ideologies for explaining Kurdish problem and to try to radically criticize the domination of “the other” nation, and rereading Kurdish identity, I thought it necessary to ask questions about the origins and foundations of the Kurdish problem instead of prescribing solutions for the guidance of Kurdish contemporary movements. Kurdish crisis and its interaction or its opposition to Iranian rationale is fundamental, more fundamental than contemporary leftist, nationalist or Islamist ideologies. Therefore, to recognize Kurdish identity basically and to criticize the foundations for the dominance of “the other” rationality, we needed to go back to the origins. Crisis foundation of Kurdish problem is rooted in the crisis of the foundations of the Iranian / historical rationality domination. To introduce Kurdish question, one must return to the zero point and vacuum origin, and he or she must start from scratch when the dialectic of good and evil was formed, and rationality from irrationality, logos from Eros, the holy from unholy and Ahura (God) from Ahriman (Devil) were separated. As the result, irrational negative counterconcepts such as Eros, Non-holy, Evil and Devil became permanent in the domination of truth while addressing the Kurds and the door to every dialogue about this problem was closed as outside the circle of disbelief and evil. Therefore, it was a zero point in which unreasonable Iranian historical / religious thought pushed the non-reasonability of Kurdish intellectual thought from the thoughtful and clarity domain of history to hapless and dark historic/nationalist valley. Definition of reason/ irrationality, evil/goodness, God/Satan, are definitions based on the other, and there is no connection between language and reality in the

meanings of these terms. This historical “the other” caused separation in the continuation of the Kurdish identity; it was “the other” that emerged prior to the Kurdish identity and called itself goodness, the wisdom and God, and it termed the earlier Mithra as evil, unwise and demon.

Kurds issue is neither legal nor moral, not economic, or political, but a philosophical to be or not to be question related to the whole history problem or the philosophy of being and becoming history. Kurdish question cannot be explained by the cultural concepts and contemporary leftist, nationalist or religious ideologues. Kurdish issue is to be or not to be question of the entire culture and ideology of the humankind. Therefore, I want to put identify-construction of the contemporary practical movements in brackets and parentheses and return to the foundations of the problem.

Kurdish issue is not a separate piece to be studied through analyzing Kurdish social/ political structure. It is not also one of the pieces of the game, but it is the unsettled rules of the game of history not having a definite position inside the game. Kurdish problem is thoughtless domain of thoughtful history. Therefore, any step to theorize and identify it without understanding the crisis in the foundations of history and the rationality of the domination of “the others” is useless. For this reason, this study addresses the problem in action and in reaction to the dominant Iranian, Greek and Semitic rationality, especially the Iranian one, which, according to Hegel, are the entrance corridors of history and as the results, they are ‘the other’ of the Kurds. Kurdish issue is one side of the dialectic of history and non-history, good and evil, and Ahura and Ahriman. This research must focus on the dialectic of Iran / Persia, Kurd / Mede; as the result, the cause of the Kurdish problem can be explored in relation to the emerging historical crisis in the foundation of dominant ration of Iran's political rationality or intellect and Zoroastrianism. With the advent of history, Kurd was pushed out back to prehistoric era, and with contemplation of history, it was driven into an unconscious sphere of history. Therefore, Kurds are a pre-historic and a post-modern ethnic group; the history and all philosophical / historical concepts are a break in the continuity of Kurd / Mithra's identity. History and the beginning of history, i.e. Iran / Zoroastrianism is the split and contrast of the Mithra / Mede, on the one hand, and they are confiscation and continuation of it through changing its meaning, on the other. History began with questions about the crisis and the answers of religion and philosophy in history were reactions to the Kurd/Mithra's crisis. Kurd was, therefore, “the other” of religion and philosophy.

The Kurd question has been the real thing that has not given way or yielded to the order of history of Iran. At the same time, this symbolic order has been formed on the basis of Kurd negation and making it as “the other”. That is why it has been marginalized and hated by the historic rationality beginning with Iranianism. Therefore, instead of analyzing the problem in the form of cultural symbols and ideologies, there should be an existential and ontological basis questioning culture and history in general. In this regard, expressing the identity of the Kurdish revolts and criticizing the dominant historical rationality beginning with Iranian rationality complement each other.

What we should consider in this study is the structural analysis of Iranian classical political rationality and the other or non-Iranian of it; the other that has been abstracted in the form of AjayDhak, Turanian, Demon, Ahriman and Zendiq. We found out in this historical survey that all these titles have been addressed to Kurd people. By expanding our studies and examining

the structure of classic Semitic, Greek, and even Islamic rationality, we became aware of utilizing such concepts in relation to the Kurds people. History has begun with Iran and Cyrus/Zoroastrianism as Hegel and Jaspers have pointed out; the beginning of history is the same classical structure of Iranian, Semitic and Greek ration. Therefore, the other or nonhistory is Kurd. The dominant members of history have defined themselves as goodness, truth and light versus the superstition of the demons, Ahriman and Zahhak. By matching myths and concepts with the realities of history and reversing the dualism of Iranian, Semetic and Greek metaphysical contrastive concepts, we discovered the political/ethnic origins of these mythological concepts. Besides, we understood the ontological confrontation of Eros v. Logos, Earth v. the sky, equality justice in contrast to classical / Platonic justice, Prometheus in contrast to Hermes, and terrestrial/ conventional legitimacy in opposition to the metaphysical / divine right in this study. As the result, history began with the transition from the first to the latter, i.e. transition from the rule of the Medes / Kurds to Iran / Semite and Greece dominance. The Starting date of history was with Cyrus / Zoroastrianism, and it ended with Mede / Aji Dahak and Mithra / Median Ahriman. Beginning of the end of history was the end of its beginning, the ending that will be the restarting of Kurds in post-historical era.

There have been proposed minor legal solutions (equal rights), moral (oppressive) economic (economic equality) and political (political participation) for the Kurdish question in general and its relationship to Iran, in particular without being seriously questioned. Kurdish political ontology and its opposition to the political ideology of Iran are not reducible to neither economic and tribal issues, nor political and not general moral or legal solutions. This research addresses the philosophical question and Kurdish ontology and its dominant rationales instead of posing some solutions.

Kurds' insurgencies, on the one hand, and the emergence of modern and post-modern discussions about identity, ethnicity and nationality, on the other hand, paved the way for its serious presentation and its relation to Iranianism. On the one hand, the great views of modernity concerning national identity and nationalism give a tool to the hands of Iranian intellectuals in strengthening Persian identity and language, on the other hand, also views about post-modernism attempting to contextualize the margin, have provided a tool for Kurds intellectuals to resist against the political / cultural hegemony of the center.

Many have defined the Kurds as the most original Iranian people, having kinship or relation with the Persians and part of Iranian culture and civilization. Iranians claim that there is no contradiction between the two and the Kurds are inseparable part of Iranian identity and culture. However, it should be noted that suspension of the contrast between Kurds and Persians have been solved from within one of its elements, that is, only from the angle of Iranian mentality. Since Kurds' political action did not have its own theory and mindset, this mentality of the Persians about the Kurd has been established and accepted. They, the Persians, have resolved the contradiction between Iran and Iran's image of Kurd rather than the conflict of Iran with the real Kurd; thus, the real Kurd has been totally erased from the Iranian image eliminating the need to resolve the conflict with it. Merely Iranian Kurd, not the real Kurd, is a proposition of the Iranian ration. If we study history out of the Iranian perspective, Iranianism does not connote anything except conflict with Kurds.

With all the tragic results that Kurdish insurgencies have created, the Kurdish issue has not been presented at the theoretical level except comically. "The others" works (Iran, Arab, and

Turks) about the Kurd problem have confiscated it or reduced it as related to outside and subordinate causes. Kurds' writings under the framework of the right-seeking and abstract generic moral theories, such as the right to determine fate have had an equal share in reducing and confiscating the issue rather than explaining it. Kurd problem has never been seriously theorized and reasons behind it have never been questioned.

Kurds have been known as an insulting and outspoken ethnic group from Sumerian inscriptions up to today's journals. What are the secret of all of the Kurdish revolts and at the same time their succumbing and successive failures? Who are they and what do they want? Why are not social science methods capable of analyzing or explaining the problem? Why is the Iranian identity with all the claims regarding the Kurds as the most original Iranian people and kinship of Kurds and Pars are not capable of digesting and solving Kurdish problem? What is Iran's relationship with Kurds' identity, history, politics, and race? Questions about who Kurds are and their demands and its relation to Iranian culture and identity is an epistemic matter. Meaning, as Wilhelm Dilthey says, is the relationship with the past. Therefore, to answer this question, one must refer to the history and the past. We are – as Jaspers says – who we are because of history. History, according to Collingwood, is for the sake of anthropology; thus, to understand who we are that others are not, we have to go back to our distinctive history and past.

Kurdish intellectuals, regardless of history and characteristics, attribute the problem to a rightseeking spirit; nonetheless, general concepts such as truthfulness cannot definitely quench the thirst of a real scholar and a historian who are investigating the distinct history of a nation. Other scholars also see the roots of Kurdish rebukes in economic problems, the modern state, or the intervention of foreigners. However, the Kurd demands are not related to universal rightseeking concepts, and not to economic and tribal issues. Further, Modern nationalism also does not meet the specific needs of the Kurds as it imparts the abstract concepts on to the Kurdish national / ethnic spirit.

In the absence of philosophical thoughts, concepts and categories, on the one hand, and the lack of philosophical understanding of the logic of Kurdish action, on the other hand, Kurdish historians cannot go beyond the mere historical events and define an independent history of Iranian history for the Kurd. Therefore, compilation of concepts and the theory appropriate with Kurd history is only feasible with the help of a general understanding of history and its dialectical connection with the Iranian political rationality. It is only through the formulation of concepts and philosophical understanding of history that we can transcend beyond mere mentioning of historical events and discover the rules of the Kurd logic of action. If Kurds' logic of performance and its dialectical relation with the crystallized historical intellect in Iranian intellect can be expressed in the form of concepts, then perhaps general theories for Kurdish history can be formulated. Given the fact that this writer believes that history, as Windleband, is part of national ethics and national self-consciousness, this work is an attempt to achieve historical and philosophical self-consciousness.

Iranian historians and ... investigate about the Kurds as an ideological tool of their own nationality for the digestion or rejection of Kurd ethnic identity; they reduce the roots of rebellion and riots from behalf of the Kurds to secondary issues such as economy, modern state, or interference of foreigners. Center-oriented researchers, instead of identifying Kurd problem, are trying to digest and absorb Kurds as a part or a branch of their civilization with an

instrumental and ideological view and, in this way, they have replaced Iranian image of Kurds instead of its real image and, hence, they have imposed it on the history.

Therefore, Iranian scholars' research regarding Kurd are parts of the Iranian / Persian dominant rationality that must be seriously questioned. Also Orientalists' studies that take place in the framework of traditional social science methodology and also in mega narrative of national state have described Kurd history, not as an independent identity, but as part of an Iranian or Islamic identity. As the result, we need new theories for a new reading of Kurd history.

Theories of political science and social sciences usually arise after formation and development of a process for its interpretation and explanation; even theories of revolution are formed after the realization of revolutions. The centerpiece of the social science theories is the state. This is while the Kurdish movements have never succeeded in formulating and realizing in the form of government that can be explained within the framework of political theories and social sciences. The Kurdish question cannot be explained within the framework of social science theories. It is a "to be" or "not to be" question of the whole theory.

Kurd issue is fraught with the split of theory and practice of action, and the reality of the actions of Kurdish movements has been separated from a corresponding thought appropriate to it. The logic of action has been based on the intellectual logic of Iranian / Arab intellect, yet it has a fundamental difference with it. In Kurdish uprisings, action, not practice, has been seen from the viewpoint of Iran / Arab intellectuality. Since the rule behind Kurd logic was not that of a metaphysical Iran / Arab thought, the logic of Kurd action inevitably imposed its dominant thoughts without thinking in the absence of an idea that was in accordance with the requirements of Kurd action.

For this reason, the logic of the act of negation and actuality has remained stable regardless of the style of thought consistent with the logic of its action. If it has used the modes of thought of Iran/Arab intellect, it has been again in line with the rejection and contradiction because it has not been able to create thinking in accordance with its practice. Although Kurd could not have formulated reason and concepts consistent with the logic of his action, it has imposed the logic of his action without intellectual support and the avoidance to formulate the concept should not be understood in the sense of its lack of content.

In the continuity of the declination of theory and the lack of the creation of a proper theory of action, action in the decay of theory resulted in the other deterioration or means. Therefore, the refusal of the concept and imagination of Kurdish order has been the reason for its political refusal, and until political action does not process the proper theory and discourse, it cannot have an independent politics and cannot create a Kurdish order.

The secret of all the successive riots and successive failures of the Kurds is in the lack of unity of theory and practice, not servitude and betrayal of people. If logic of Kurd action does not find its own proper parallel concepts and culture, the logic of action is inevitably drowned and degenerated in another dominant culture. Concepts and categories appropriate to the logic of action cannot be inferred from abstract concepts of Western nationalism or general moral concepts, and they cannot be reduced to economic and tribal sub-issues. These concepts can only be induced with a philosophical understanding of history and the conceptualization of riots and their political history.



The meaning behind Kurd's political action must be discovered and conceptualized through qualitative analysis and an interpretive view and under the framework of Kurdish historical movements. We must comprehend mental action and significance of Kurdish uprisings avoiding positivist (cause and effect) and reductionist moral abstract outlooks.

One has to understand what ideas and requirements Kurds have had in their minds and how they have looked at the world, man, and history in such a way that they have not given up to any logical order and history and have been continually revolting.

To do this, we must ignore the obvious facts and use many references and historical documentation to explain the Kurd logic of action. To know who we are, we need to know our distinctive history. History refers to actions, not incidents and events mere mentioning, actions express thoughts. We need to deduce Kurdish thoughts and tendencies behind Kurdish historical performances. Therefore, the purpose of this research is the unification of theory and practice, and thought with reality in Kurd history. The purpose is the emancipation of the Kurd logic of action under the dominance of another culture and finding concepts and reason corresponding to the logic of action, during the history.

Concepts and thoughts hidden behind the political act of Kurd is still not in the form of words. Since we look at our history from the other's angles or without a philosophical understanding, we are unable to understand those concepts and Kurd national spirit. We regard Kurds as part of Iranian, Islamic, or Arabian culture and civilization or mention merely the event and frame the abstract nationalism on Kurd history as "uncharted tribal history". The purpose, here, is the conceptualization of order / government for the Kurds so as to surpass the refusal to its possibility; therefore, the possibility of the concept of the order of the Kurdish state is conditional on its political possibility.

Why is Iran, with a history of thousand years that has overcome every crisis, unable to solve Kurdish problem? Political wisdom of Iran, which originated from Zoroastrian mythology and religion nourished with Islamic culture and modern ideologies, have always put its form on the material of history. Each time it has risen up from its own ashes beyond the developments of the real political and objective historical realm, it has imposed its intellectual form over the dispersed historical materials, and it has rebuilt its own system of meanings and ancient intellectual structures. But it has never been able to digest and solve Kurd problem.

The mere incident of military clashes indicates lack of a solution to the problem. Ultimately, Iran failing to solve the problem, eliminated the problem and reduced it to external and secondary factors. Therefore, the question which has arisen is twofold: on the one hand, it is what the Kurds want that they are considered as evils by the dominant historical cultures. As the result, they have always preferred freedom in the mountains to civilization and urban servitude and they have always become notorious as the outsider rebels and as evil ethnic group from the Sumerian inscriptions to today's papers. On the other hand, what the nature and components of Iranian / historical political intellect are and what contradiction it has with Kurdish identity--seeking that it has never been able to digest and solve the problem from the Cyrus' divine charisma (Frah Izadi) up to the present day. Why does the Iranian political ration try to suppress and reject Kurds with the counter-concepts of evil, demon, devil and the alien, on the one hand, and, why does it attempt to absorb them with the notions of genuine Iranian people, on the other? Against what crisis has Iran's political ration been reformulated and

rebuilt? The components of Iran's political intellect with the central denominator of the divine right of the kings (Farah Izadi), heavenly legitimacy, Platonic justice / hierarchy, the religious/Apollonian and epistemic Hermeticism, have definitely been revived against its counter-concepts. Components such as consensual democracy, earthly/conventional legitimacy, equality justice, culture or anti-Dionysian cultures / anti-religious and proletarian spirits are counter-concepts in opposition to Iranian political ration.

Political struggle between Iranian political wisdom and its “the other”, on the one hand, has been an ethnic/political struggle up to the present time such as the conflict between Cyrus and Astiag, Darius and Gaumata and Anushirvan and Mazdak. On the other hand, the controversy between the two political rationales, i.e. the hierarchy with equality, divine right with a social contract, agreement democracy with religious tyranny has been a controversy between two ontological views of the world as well. Though the main subject of the Kurdish tradition is Mithra (contract / paradise) with the symbol of bull slaying, the philosophy of the emergence of Zoroastrianism is the support for the sacred bull, while Mithra is a terrestrial and humanly religion, Zoroastrianism is a metaphysical and divine religion.

Mithra is a terrestrial order involving a contract, while Zarathustra is the divine order with the divine right for the kings. Therefore, the political / ethnic controversy of Pars with Med is a controversy between the two ontological views of Logos against Eros, the law against human wisdom, the spirit against the celestial, and the sky against the earth. Symbolic signs of this Pars quadrilateral with Medes are light against darkness, Ahura against evil, eagle against snake, bull against lion, and ultimately goodness against evil. Of course, all of these denominations, or at least some of division of symbols into goodness and evil was molded by the later sign of Pars / Zarathustra into the earlier Mede / Mithra, and the good ness and evil has not yet appeared among the earlier signs in the horizon of meaning.

What constituted the consolidation of Iranian / Zoroastrian concepts and symbols as good and material symbols as evil was one of the logic of history, the other was the ethnic / political domination of Pars. Therefore, the Iranian central signifier of Persian domination has Iranian government as its military device and symbols and religion as its hegemonic instrument. If we investigate history from the narrative of the ruling nation anew, we find out that the components of Iranian political intellect have been reproduced equally in every period from Zoroaster and Achaemenids to the Sassanid. Each time its antithesis has appeared in the spirit of Kurdish people/nation. The political ration of Iran has been re-produced with the elements mentioned in the Zoroastrian / Ahura period versus Mithra / Ahriman, Cyrus / Fereydon, versus Ajidahak / Astiag, Kaykhosrow in contrast to Turanian, Darius versus Gaumata / False Berdia, Sassanids versus Mazdak, up to the Khoramdinan and the contemporary period. Therefore, the political wisdom of Iran has been formulated and reproduced against Kurds quest for identity in all three ancient, middle, and contemporary periods.

Iran's rationality (myth, religion, science, and ideology), is the tool in the service of the Iranian government and the Iranian government, is the tool of the political domination of the Persian people. This shows that Iranian knowledge starting from Kianian's mythology and Zoroastrianism to the religion of Islam and Shi'asm and up to contemporary knowledge and ideology, from the concept of Ahuramazda and Behdini (the best religion) to the concept of multi-ethnic plural Iran lacks meaning and depth and its significance is underneath the political infrastructure of the Persian ethnicity. On the one hand, Persian ethnic domination is political/

religious, and, on the other hand, it is hegemonic and religious, which, has simultaneously justified itself along with its political/ethnic domination under the Ahuraian, Zoroastrianism, Islamic, goodness, Multiethnic Iran, civilization and ... order and it has described its political / ethnic oppositions, i.e. Kurds in the form of counter-concepts of Ahriman, Demon, Zandiq, goblin, separatists, Zahhak the brain-eater, head-cutter Kurd, Turanian, Evil and Dragon. Therefore, Persian rationality from Ahura to the plural Iran is a tool or reproducer of the ethnic/political domination of Pars on Mede / Kurd. Since the ruling dynasty of Persia was the narrator of history, recorded its ideological narrative as "historical facts in the rule of truth" and Kurds themselves have accepted it in the absence of a Kurdish historiography.

Although the subject of this book is historical, the book is not limited to mentioning the historical event and it examines the political situation in the context of history. Political antagonism has been stimuli in constructing history. The political affair is devoted to the self and the other Pars itself, who has written history, has introduced its political "the other" to "the other" of civilization and history in the field of narratives in general. The Iranian/Persian politics has inspired religion, mythology and historical narratives in general, and the other of Persian politics has become the other of religion, mythology, and symbols. Due to political domination, the political affairs of Persia has been victorious in narrating historical events and it has described itself as self- herald of political power in the form of positive and good concepts via formulating negative and evil concepts in address to the other political one, i.e. the Kurd. It has also abstracted political controversy in the form of the struggle of the totems, mythology and religion. History is accessible to us through representation and linguistic texts. We have no access to the metaphysical and objective history concerning who and for which purpose has narrated these linguistic texts. Thus, this clarifies link between historiography and political affair and the text with outside condition, that is, its political / cultural context. History is the function of the narrative model and up to now Kurdish history has been described by the others. Therefore, without the autopsy of another narrative, it is not possible to process the selfnarrative from the Kurd history. History is a form of power and historical texts reflect power relations. The historical text which consider Kurdish history as a part of Iranian history is a reflection of the political dominance of Pars that defined Kurdish territory and culture as part of Iran.

The contrast between Kurd and Iran is far from "foreign interference", " modern government", economic deprivation", lack of "plurality in unity" or "civil nationalism". Unlike the Iranian narration of history, Kurds are not Iranian / Aryan ethnic group, but they are aboriginals of their land before the Aryans / Persians, and the political intellect of Iran has evolved based on negation and "the other" making of Kurdish identity. "Iranwiz" and Iranian religion and government have evolved in confrontation and rejection of the Kurds. Iran is referred to the land of the settled Medes which Iranians seized by force and called it Iran, i.e. their lost paradise. The Iranian religion of Zoroastrians developed against the median religion of Mithra. The basis of the Iranian government has been the tool of ethnic domination of Pars on Med.

The Achaemenids / Persian Empire was formed through the military defeat, suppression, and marginalization of the Median / Kurdish empire. Even the Iranian symbols and works such as Persepolis and the inscription of Behistun are reminiscent of their victories over the Kurds. Furthermore, the Persian language did not come into existence through internal evolution, but Darius overnight ordered Elamite and Babylonian scribes to write it on the inscription of Behistun to preserve the memory of the victory of the Persians on the Medes. Kurds and their

rituals were entitled as Ahriman, Daoi Mazina, Dave, Ajidhak / Zahhak, Afrasiab, and Turanians, Zandiq, pagan, Jinn or goblin and the alien agent in Iranian mythology and culture. The controversy over totem symbols like bull and lion, and snake and eagle is the abstraction of the ethnic struggles of Persians and Medians. Even the ethical notions of goodness against evil, light versus darkness, represent the ethnic domination of Pars on Mede that have shown their victorious-self as positive and the other defeated one, in the form of evil and dark concepts. The Aniran or 'the other' of Iranvij are the same Kurds. It does not mean that Iran has not defined other "the others" for itself, such as Arabs or Turks, etc. However, the era of the advent of Iranian intellect was not shaped except in the face of the Kurds and their identity and land, and the philosophical development of Iran's political intellect was not formulated via the military crackdown on Turks and Mongols and ... but in the ritualistic / ideological struggle with the anti-metaphysical bio-Dionysian life of the Kurds. Since the basis of Iranian rationality has been formed based on the denial and rejection of the Kurdish identity, the possibility of any dialogue is not possible in the framework of Iranian intellect. It is worthy of reflection that they not only denied and rejected Kurds politically / ideologically but also confiscated the whole culture and identity of Medes and imparted Iranian/Zoroastrian sense on it. They dismantled Medes / Kurds via confiscating their culture, changing the meaning of its elements, and owning their culture and civilization as well. Iranian ration confiscated Medes identity at the same time that it was in opposition to it. Iran's intellect is a breakdown in the continuation of Kurdish identity.

The model of Aniran or the other of Iran, like the Iranian intellect itself like a dark shadow and an unconscious spirit and twins but the opposite of the Iranian intellect is always present and at the same time absent and rejecting it. The dialectic of the Iranian intellect does not have any meaning other than being in contrast with the other of itself, the other one that while present is absent and is the other side of Iranian ration coin. This "the other" is not a joke of myths scribes, but it heralds the other meaning that at the dawn of the horizon warns sunset of Iranian intellect. It is simultaneously "a real affair" except based on its negation, Iranian "symbolic" ration cannot be formed. Every identity needs "the other" to stabilize its semantic constituents while rejecting it and at the same time always standing in front of it. Knowing the Iranian intellect depends totally on the knowledge regarding its opposites; it is like a mirror both present and at the same time evil and opposing it in which the Iranian intellect reforms and reconstruct its good face against it. Another Iranian political intellect, albeit absent in appearance, it is included as a deeper meaning inside it. There is another Iran as an obscure but operative element. The political intellect of Iran has achieved its semantic pattern through differentiating between itself and Aniran which supposedly does not exist. Therefore, one can deduce Iranian and "the other" model of Iran's ideology from the contradictions of Iran and its theoretical and conceptual contrasts because binary oppositions of Iran and its Aniran find meaning in opposition to each other. Consequently, the concepts and components of the Iranian intellect will not be meaningful except in contrast to the other (Aniran).

The power of Iranian logos against Eros and Kurdish biology has always outspoken itself under the name of religion and God. Therefore, the Iranian ration has closed every way of interacting with Kurd. On the one hand, there is an Iranian intellect sending out the military with the cultural backing of the clerics and the priests or intellectuals towards Kurds, and makes any image and relationship with Kurd impossible out of the concrete unity of heathen, separatist, Demon, Ajidahak and alien agent. On the other hand, there is Kurd that can communicate with

“the other” only via an intellectual intermediary, which is represented in the discipline of physical and ethical principles and in accordance with the dominant rules and norms; an intellect that only expresses the interests of Iranian intellect and signifies their values. Therefore, dialogue is going on within a semantic structure based on the interests and domination of Iran involving the principle of maintaining Iranian interest rather than solving Kurd problem; otherwise, it must inevitably keep going out of the entire circle of rationality.

Therefore, it is necessary to criticize the Iranian political ration in order to deny ethnic domination and domination of the general concepts of Iran over Kurdish life. This is the same criticism of the authoritarian ration and the domination of the one-ethnicity monarchy of Persians to cut on the root of Iranian political rationality so as to clear away Iranianism dust and to provide the conditions to know Kurd’s real history, which is the basis of Kurdish identity. Therefore, the reality of the truth of the Iranian political intellect is rooted in its authoritarian tyranny and the reality of Iranian tyranny is originated in its class structure and its ethnic domination. The world of Iranian truth about Kurd must be challenged to reveal the truth of the world of Iranian domination on Kurd. The causes for the historical tyranny of the land of Iran are the same causes that have produced the powerful myths of Shah's (The thought of the Greater Iran) and powerful Iranian governments. The unacceptable domination of the Persian people in lack of popularity among other people’s needs to justify its domination to preserve it on the on hand and it requires powerful myths on the other. Therefore, the cause of Iranian despotism is neither in Iranian thought itself nor in the structure of the state itself but it is in the ethnic rule of Persia which requires both strong government and attractive mythology to continue it. Therefore, the Iranian government from the Achaemenids’ Farah Izadi to the Islamic Wali Faqih is the political / military tool of Persian ethnic domination; furthermore, from Iranian culture and thought of Zoroastrian mythology to Islam and up to nationalism and the leftist is the hegemonic tool of the Persian domination. Iranian ration is political and it involves tools and instruments at the hands of Persian politics.

The Iranian political intellect has had the same logic and components that have been ex-pressed in a variety of shapes such as myth, religion, and ideology. The basis of this intellect is the union of the companions of the pen owners (the Magi, the cleric and the intellectual) with the companions of the sword owners. Components of Iranian political intellect have been reshaped and reproduced from the period Farah Izadi of Cyrus up to this day with different expressions but in the same style. The components of Iranian political representations have continued and reproduced themselves in the form of Cyrus and Darius, Achaemenids and Anoshirvan Sassanids, Taherian, Pahlavi monarchy and Islamic Republic. The identity elements of the Kurds have also been reproduced and sustained in the form of the movements and riots of Guti, Mede, Gaumata, Mazdak, Khoramddin, and contemporary movements and parties.

The main question of this study is: what messages and thoughts would the relationship of Iranianism with Kurdism and the reaction of Iranian political rationality having the central signifier of ethnic domination and components such as Farah Izadi, Platonic justice / class, religious culture/Zoroastrianism, and metaphysical legitimacy along with signs like bull and eagle in the form of positive notions of light and truth signify, and in contrast to what signs and symbols were they formulated, and what are their political functions?

Our hypothesis here is based on the fact that the political power of Iran is the tool of politics and domination of the Persian national government. It has evolved from the period of Cyrus

and Zoroaster to Darius and Anoshirvan in contrast to the Medes' identity. Thus, it has made the Mede identity as "the other" of itself which has the central sign of freedom from domination and floating signs such as agreement democracy with earthly legitimacy and Mithra/social contract, Dionysian / Mithraism culture and, anti-culture and anti-class justice with signs such as snake and lion in the form of dark, evil, and devil counterconcepts. In fact, the main subject of Kurd identity is Mithra (contract /paradise). The contract means the denial of the political guardian and the realization of the contractual political order. The paradise also means the rejection of the metaphysical / religious guardian and the realization of paradise in this world with the will and wisdom of humankind. Thus, it was against Mithra/contract that the Iranian / Persian nation constructed the cosmic order and it was in opposition to the earthly paradise or Mithra/Paradise that the Iranian/Persian nation abstracted religion, and metaphysics.

The analytical method used in this study is qualitative including discourse analysis and the method of interpretation (Hermeneutics). To survey the resources in the Discourse Analysis Method, one should focus on in-line analysis and communication within the text and out-of-text, and questions like the followings are asked: who and for what purposes has text been produced?

What are the relation between the text and the words used in it, the non-contextualization of the text, the cultural and political context governing the production of the text, and who produced the text in the context of this discourse? What political power has been behind the production of the text and what its goals were. Through the hermeneutic approach, we try to discover, in the context of political / social practices, the mental action and the meaning that contributes to the creation of their social practices. What style of life do Kurds have in mind? What look do they have to humans and beings? What meaning is behind their political actions? Since the Persian people were the dominant and producers of the text and the narrators of the events' history, while the Kurds did not have the power to produce the text and they showed themselves through their actions, we utilize method of discourse analysis to examine Iran's political intellect and hermeneutics to study the identity seeking of Kurds. The representatives of Persian intellect, because of being conquerors, were the owners of the texts from Zarathustra and Darius to Anoshirvan and from the Gutas to the inscriptions of Behistun, and to Avesta, and Khodainama (the god of letters). For however given reasons, we do not have any texts about the Medes from Mithra and Zahhak to Gaumati and Mazdak and we have to study the Medes through the method of discourse analysis. Thus, using hermeneutical method, we interpret transcendental meaning of action and its meanings. There is no other way apart from hermeneutics, not like that of the **Schleiermacher's** (1768 – 1834) type, but like Gadamer's (1900-2002), to interpret the meaning of their deeds, since what history left of them for us are the deeds and acts that need to be interpreted, or the texts of its opponents that are not free from bias. Therefore, these texts have political / social functions ranging from Gata to Avesta and from inscriptions to their authors' intentions in conjunction with the ethnic / religious fabric that governed them. For example, Ahriman Avesta is a source of Zoroastrian intentions that originated in the context of the religious conflict of the region and has a political function to justify itself and deny the legitimacy of 'the other' nicknamed Ah-ri-man. Besides, all the concepts of falsehood, Ajay Dhak, Dive and ... the inscriptions of Behistun and all of Iranian mythology are in the same way. The author of the text is one of the parties involved and he has written it with a specific intention to acquit himself and condemn the other. Furthermore, every text is not separate from its ethnic / religious context and it has a political function to eliminate the dissent voices and to legitimize oneself. Therefore, at first, we disclose the other ruling text

with the method of discourse analysis, the relation of text / knowledge, with the political / ethnic context and its political function to abstract the hidden truths from the constructed dust. Then, we have no choice except to interpret political symbols and actions, in the absence of Kurd text. The author has not used the method of analysis in an obvious and direct way in order not to make the writing of the book artificial and non-technical. However, we examined the meanings of Iranian concepts, such as Avestan Gathas and inscriptions in relation to the political / ethnic context and disclosed the other-making ethnic political view of it and we investigated its political agenda. On the other hand, we have utilized the method in an intangible way to give meaning and conceptualization of Kurdish revolt.

This book consists of three parts and eight chapters with an introduction and conclusion. The first chapter that includes theoretical framework consists of two sections: the first section which is about the relationship between ration and politics attempts to provide a systematic model of criticism of Iran's political intellect. Further, the process of philosophical transition from theories of metaphysical truth and metaphysics to human life and body and intellect has been reviewed to criticize Iranian political ration which uses the mega-concepts of ethics, religion and the truth to suppress Kurd movements. The second section, using certain concepts such as tragedy, ... tries to present a theoretical framework for the development of the problem. The second chapter is a historical general introduction to the descriptive and transient history of Kurdistan. In this chapter, it is attempted to examine movements such as Mad, Geumata, Mazdak, Kharmadineen, and it also investigates the theory of Kurds being indigenous inhabitant of the region versus the theory of being Aryan and being Azerbaijanian and its governments such as Shadadian and Rawadian to provide an introduction to analyze and conceptualize them in future chapters.

The third chapter, which is the most important part of this office, attempts to test the hypothesis and concept of Kurd identity seeking. In the first chapter of the fourth chapter, it is stated that the Iranian empire was not an ally of the Median state, and it was not essentially formed except through the rejection of the Medes. Iranian empire was a Persian-oriented system that developed only in opposition to the Medes. I have challenged common but baseless theories of the shared domination of Med and Pars and the satisfaction of the Medes from the domination of Pars with the help of valid sources. In this section, we have inferred concepts such as socialist and equality justice, tribal democracy, earthly/Dionysian culture, contractual/territorial legitimacy and proletariat spirit from political Kurdish movements using authoritative sources. We have stated that Kurds are not Iranian racially and culturally / politically but also Iran's political intellect has evolved with the stated components in contradiction and negation of the Kurds. Each section examines one of the components. The second discussion examines the social and economic structure of the Medes and Persians / Achaemenids, and I have argued that there is not only any compromise between them, but Iranian system has been essentially developed in opposition to Median system. In the third discussion, I have examined the Median state in contrast to Iranian government i.e. one is based on agreement democracy and the other is based on the divine right of the kings which are in complete opposition with each other. In the fourth discussion, the Zoroastrian religion has been investigated versus the Median religion of Mithra. As the result, it has been proven that the foundation of the emergence of Zoroastrianism, which later became the ideology of the Iranian Empire, was developed in confrontation with and against the Mithra religion of Medians. In the fifth discussion, I have reviewed and compared the national totems and anthems of these two nations. Sixth discussion is devoted to "the other"

or Aniran of Iranian mythology claiming that the Aniran of Iranian mythology, that is, Zakhak and Turanians, demons and devils are the same Kurds and their Mithraism religion.

In the fourth chapter, we have investigated the historical period of Darius, along with Gaumata Kurdish movements, Frevartish and Chiserna, which like the second section, I have tested some hypothesis and concepts. The fifth chapter deals with the historical period of the Sassanian and Anoshirvan in confrontation with Kurdish movements of Mazdakian through which there have been reproduced the concepts of Iran's political ration and the Kurds identity seeking. The sixth chapter examined the concept of Iranwuj and Kurd, action and reaction to that concept with the arrival of Iranians, Mede becoming Kurd that means Kurd becoming slave. Whatsoever known as Iran was the land of the Kurds captured by the Persians and then was called Iran through their military/religious authority. Thereafter, I presented a theory of government in the Middle East (Persian, Kurdish, and Arabic). In Chapter 7, I briefly outline the antagonism and reaction of the Greek and Semitic political ration towards Kurdish quest for identity in order to abstract the theory of the contradictions of the historical ethnic groups with the Kurd up to the level of a general theory. In the next chapter, i.e. Chapter 8, I have presented the general theory of the confrontation / continuation of history with Kurd. History, while contradicting and breaking, is the continuation of the Mithra / Mede; therefore, I have presented a general theory concerning the classification of Kurd history and finally we come to the summary and conclusion.

This book is part of the research tying to reconstruct Kurdish political history and its actions and reactions to the political intellect of Iran in particular and history in general. This project is aimed at achieving self-awareness and the restoration of Kurdish culture and identity which would not possible except via removing the dust of Iranian history and culture from it. Although the subject of the book is history, the book is not a historical book. It examines the political affair in history to challenge the foundations of the political action of the Iranian government on the one hand to revive the foundations of the polittical action of government and Kurdish culture through conceptualization of Kurd political action. Although I started my studies on the history in 1382/2003, the main idea of this book came to my mind in 1385/2006. The reason behind the d-lay in writing the current book was that I insisted on stating my idea and theoretical hypothesis through collecting the reliable data, facts and resources. I have already processed the main subject and theoretical view of the second volume of the book, but since the author's method is to express the theoretical idea in the form of valid facts and resources, writing it will also be delayed. Therefore, those who follow a word to the wise is enough will find the book's theoretical notion convincing. If we look at the book carefully, many issues have been discussed for the first time from the current angle. At the same time, not only were all new and novel topics presented in the form of reliable resources and facts, but also I insisted on using the resources confirmed or written by Iranian scientific society themselves.

With the continual emphasis on Iranian sources, it seems that I have accepted all their preconditions regarding Iran's history, but I have changed their meaning from the inside out and I have used their own assumptions against them. If I assumed the whole history of Iran as reconstructed, and, like Pourpirar and Mostafa Vaziri, if I challenged all the orientalist sciences of history, the possibility of rebuilding Kurdish history would have lost its legitimacy. With all the criticisms about Orientalist science, we require orientalist science for restoring our history. Therefore, by accepting the important presuppositions of Iranian historiography proposed by



orientalists and developed by Iranian historians, I have returned their presuppositions to them, I have deduced other meanings of their concepts, and thus I have changed their implications using their paradoxes and footnotes present in their texts. That is why, if you take notice, this author will give the lowest references to those who are critics of Iranian historiography and I have given the most references to Iranian historians or orientalists popular among Iranian historians. Another creative aspect of this book is presenting a theoretical plan in the framework of their own resources and experiments and covering the main theory in the framework of “the others” sources. In the case that they influx and criticize the book's ideas, they should also confront their own sources and historians. Unfortunately, the Kurd readers’ mindset is journalist and unable to philosophize and tolerate hard thinking in the study and it may be possible they lose the clues to the theory of the book in countless sources; however, I am not responsible for this. According to one of the readers of the book, the art of this book is that, on the one hand, it is theoretical and innovative and on the other hand, it is presented utilizing countless sources. Another point I should mention is theoretical basis of the book which is related to the historical content of the book. As I pointed out, this book is not merely a historical, but a philosophical/political book, and the contradiction (Kurd and history and the beginner ethnic group of history, Iran) is not only ethnical, but also philosophical. The reason for this contradiction is the emergence of metaphysical thinking in that period with centrality of history given to Cyrus / Zoroaster, which broke the Kurdish earthly thinking. Therefore, Kurds were marginalized in history and for the sake of re-emerging, it was necessary to follow the process of metaphysics emergence in turn of a historical paradigm with thinkers such as Zarathustra and Plato up to the decline of metaphysical history with thinkers such as Marx, Nietzsche and Foucault; hence, it determines the theoretical perspective of the book. Another reason for showing the decline of metaphysical concepts with Nietzsche and Marx and Freud is the domination of Iran/ Persia on Kurd/Mad has always been legitimized in the form of metaphysical concepts. Therefore, to decline Iranian rationality, we should challenge the basis of this rationality, i.e. metaphysics. This book demonstrates conceptual and symbolic opposition in the form of historical real events and collected experiments.

I was busy for nearly a decade working on the first volume and dealing with the only ancient period based on the general division of history into ancient, middle, and contemporary periods. In the first volume, I endured lots of difficulties for several reasons. On the one hand, nobody had discussed these issues before the author and there was no one to consult with or guide me; in fact, there was no forerunner doing this before me. Problems of the life and the obstacles of the university made me hurry up composing it; however, I have been busy researching, studying and thinking about it for several years. In 2008, I tried to propose it as the master's thesis in the history department of our university but I dissented because of their disagreement. Later, I offered it as the Ph.D. proposal; however, with all the support of Dr. Sadegh Zibakalam; however, I could only approve it after one year due to the opposition of other department members such as Hamid Ahmadi, Malek Yahya Salahi and Majid Tavassoli. After it was approved, they did not permit me to defend it under any circumstances. After three years of harassment and denial from the side of the group and the university and with the removal of a large part (one hundred and fifty pages) and changing the introduction and content compulsorily, I eventually defended. In all these years, there was nobody to guide and I went to every library to find something through trial and error.

The second volume is devoted to the middle or Islamic period. Khoramdinan is the beginning of the end of the first era of Kurd history. After Khoramdinan, we see a new era of Kurd history; a period in which political action was on the decline and the logic of Kurd action is plunged in “the other” Iranian / Islamic culture. Iranian retroactive and mystical Mithra was imposed on the logic of Kurd action and the Kurdistan became cradle of mysticism and Sufism. As the result of the refusal of political power, Mithra / contract is forgotten in one side, and on the other side, in the absence of freedom and government, Mithra / Paradise was re-treated from the community and drowned in the footsteps of folklore and literature. Thus the Kurd enthusiastic act and political logic was refused and declined via immersing in “the other” culture. The union of an individual with God or a state with God that we saw in the politics of the ancient times, and God was the same a state / contract, in the middle period takes an individual form of the penetration of God in mystic statements. Therefore, mysticism or Sufism is one of the main subjects of history and the middle period which is the same as the retreat from the field of politics and society into the internal and individual domain and the formation of the Iranian / Zoroastrian mystical Mithra. In breaking from the totality of a state/ God, Kurd person tries to rejoin God again in the form of personal penetration into God in particular individually and saying “ana-al haq”. However, this is neither Mithra but Sufism and instead of lowering God to its main position and the realization of the whole within him, he thinks about digesting the person in his projected totality.

The bulk of that culture and civilization shaped by the general name of Iran taken from mystics to intellectuals belongs to Kurd that should be returned to the domain of Kurdish culture and his-tory again. Although, due to the lack of Kurdish historiography, we have to use “the others” sources in the second volume too, many of the thoughts we investigated are the creation of Kurdish intellectuals, as though many of them are known as Islamic or Iranian thinkers. If the first volume was the history of politics and political action, the second volume is the history of culture. Studying literary and folkloric sources and poetry is one of the main sources for the reconstruction of Kurdish history and identity in the third chapter. The third volume is also devoted to contemporary era in which, political act was revived with the advent of modern nationalism but it was born out of the heart of mysticism and “Takaya”. This birth of nationalism from the heart of mysticism is neither accident nor appreciation: a revival without critique of the culture of decline. For this reason, the decline of culture and the surrender of mysticism has prevented the emancipation of political action in rebuilding the unity of the individual and the national government since the beginning of nationalism. Tragic action is involved in the struggle for freedom, but the mystic culture, digested in another federal and con-federal, is trying to digest and surrender. This is the secret behind all Kurdish successive insurrections in con-temporary history and their successive succumbing at the same time. On the one hand, the sedentary and unconscious Mithra is inverted; friendship and agreement with others and self-hostility with itself. On the other hand, Mithra/paradise have been disconnected from politics and community and it has been limited to the world of poetry and folklore.

Finally, I must point out that this is the second edition of this book. The first edition was published upon my request and without my own name as I myself could not publish it due to some problems. For reasons not unnecessarily to mention, it was unfortunately rushed out to print without editing and without the needed coordination with me. Later, it turned out that they have printed the wrong version, and some of the added items was not included in the book. Also, in the chapter of a plan of government theory comparing three Iranian, Arab, and Kurdish

governments, the Islamic section was removed from the book. For that reason, neither the appearance nor the content of it was not like a scientific book. Since I did not have the right to comment on it, I did not take responsibility for it either. Anyhow, I would like to thank my friends for accepting my request (Qaderi) to print it at that time. However, it did not suit my many years of hard work and I was not content with publishing it in such an abnormal and inconsistent form. The book that I (Qaderi) wrote and affirmed is the current book. Most parts of this book ended in 2013.

In fact, the file of the current book was closed in that time, but due to the lack of printing facilities and lack of authorities' permission in Iran, its publication was delayed. In the end, I need to express my greatest gratitude to my dear friend, Mr. Farzad Saifi Kardan, who, by revising the content of the book, offered valuable suggestions to improve its final compilation and he did not hesitate to help in its preparation, too.

Zakariya (Heresh) Qaderi 8/5/2016  
zakaryaqaderi@gmail.com

Part One:

Theoretical and Historical Foundations

## Chapter One:

### Ration and Politics

### Introduction:

With the advent of metaphysical history in “axial period”, Kurd was sent on to the margins of history and changed into “the other” of the history. The logic of thought and action of Kurd had a fundamental difference with the foundations of metaphysical history beginning with Iranian ration. As the result, it became, as Marr (2012) said, the forgotten nation of history. On the one hand, based on the fact that the logic of thought and action of Kurd contrasts with the logic of history and ethnic group initializing history. i. e. Iran, and the long-term historical domination of Iran on Kurd has been in the form of metaphysical concepts on the other hand; hence, it is not possible to reconstruct and redefine Kurdish political history and ideas except by the help of illustrating the decline of the metaphysics in thinkers such as Marx, Nietzsche, Freud and postmodernists. That is why we have presented the course of the emergence and decline of metaphysical history in this chapter.

Given that we analyze two different people with an interconnected history here, we need to use two separate models in the chapter on theoretical foundations. History of Iran / Pars is a positive history with established structures and its own formulated political wisdom. Nevertheless, Kurd history is neither a positive history with established structures, nor has its political wisdom been formulated but it is more actuality than positivity. To examine Iranian political ration and its criticism, we will use the theory of discourse and its theoretical foundations, which expresses the relationship between truth and power in order to measure the relation between the Iranian political text and intellect with its power structures. To investigate Kurd’s quest for identity, we utilize Hussrel’s phenomenology i.e. "returning to the thing itself" through rejecting the historical concepts and tradition around that thing (whether it is a thing or a social and cultural world) and dealing with “the same thing as Kurd” away from concepts and assumptions accumulated around it. In fact, to know Kurd, we must return to the premodern reconstructed stage of the Iranian intellect. These two methods ultimately follow the same purpose in this book. With the help of the theory of political reason and the use of ideological concepts, discourse and ..., we will decode and desacrifice it through criticizing the Iranian political intellect and discovering its connection with power. Using Husserlian / Heideggerian phenomenology, we will restore lived experiences of Kurd and its political / social actions via denying Iranian concepts and traditions of raion without the medium of concepts. Indeed, phenomenology and return to “the self” of the Kurd itself requires discourse analysis and the relationship between knowledge and power. We use these tools to state that any truth in Iranian history from mythology to ideology is a particular formulation of power and the Iranian political ration is nothing more than a reflection and justification of Iran's power and domination over the Kurd. Thus, the background for phenomenology and return to the self of the Kurd itself will be provided via the sacrifice and negation of the domination of the Iranian political intellect. Therefore, our theoretical foundations are divided into two parts. The first

section investigates in detail the relationship between reason (Knowledge, religion, myth and ideology) and power and domination in order to understand the structure of the Iranian political intellect. Politics and power were assumed as the instrument of truth and reason in classical philosophy before Nietzsche and Marx, but with the intellectual spin beginning with Nietzsche, Marx and Freud, and continuing with thinkers like Gramsci, Althusser and those like Foucault and Fairclough, this kind of relationship was inverted. Therefore, these are reason and knowledge which are tools of domination and politics and this is our approach to examine Iranian political beliefs in which the Iranian wisdom and religion have always been instrumental in the service of Iran's domination over others and its politics.

In the second part, we will provide the context for conceptualizing Kurd's quest for identity using Husserlian / Heideggerian's phenomenology in return to its own being or existence and other concepts like tragedy and the subject of racism. The living experience of Kurds has been presented mostly in the form of political action and silent action or action prior to historical/cultural conceptualization rather than being shown in the form of religion, ideology and mythology.

\*\*\*

Political Iranian reason, originated with the myths of the struggle against demon (Div), Ahriman and Zahhak and irrigated with the Islamic/Shiite culture in fighting against the infidels, Zandiqs and Goblins in the middle ages, was reproduced in the contemporary period under the title of state nationalism, the kingdom or monarchy, and Islamic system in the fight against separatism despite the repeated historical discontinuities of it. Iran's political intellect is defined based on the central signifiers of "monarchy" or "Farah Izadi" and features such as "Class society, or Platonic justice", "epistemic of the Hermes", "heavenly legitimacy" and "the religious / metaphysical culture". Given that each political reason is shaped based on denial of "the other", "the other" of Iran political intellect consists of concepts that contradict the above-mentioned concepts. Inevitably, the other of it is an idea or counterconcept that is not necessarily ethnic / radical antagonism, but a religious and ideological one historically infused in the blood and flesh of the certain people (Kurds). Contradictory Concepts of Iran's political reason involve the central signifier of agreement democracy with indicators such as: "socialist equity or equity-seeking", "earthly legitimacy", "non-sanctifiable Shah (king)", "multi (very) - gods " instead of Farah Izadi and "Dionysius / terrestrial "(culture)," and "Prometheus spirit".

When we talk about political wisdom, there will certainly arise a lot of questions for each reader: What does the wisdom mean? From the day the man has stepped into history and has reached its own self-awareness and differentiation from others, every nation, culture, and so on has put his thoughts wisdom into words, and has called his opponents as irrational and unscrupulous (Barbar). So what do we mean by reason? Platonic / Greek reason, Islamic / Iranian reason or modern/ Kantian reason?

Old philosophy has conveyed a metaphysical and sacred meaning of reason that has had the ability to recognize goodness from badness and it is only with wisdom that humans are able to identify the right path of life and direct it to the happy end. Religious civilizations not only recognized the divine truth with the means of reason but also they demonstrated their doctrines and principles under the title of wisdom / truth. Modern philosophy also defined reason as the source of the truth and the guidance of the life course and independent of the instincts and

social structures. But the rationale we have in mind is the intellectual rotation that started with Nietzsche and led to Foucault and Fairclough. We have utilized the framework of Nietzsche's and Foucault's and ... thoughts for analyzing the structure of political ration, that is, we know that wisdom is neither sacred nor independent of the instincts and the social / political structure but it is a tool of politics, instincts and domination. Therefore, we apply it in line with Foucault and Nietzsche, ... but in contrast to Plato, Zoroaster, Farabi, Kant and ... which consider the wisdom as independent and holy. Therefore, we employ political wisdom in address to those who consider wisdom as holy and independent of power and instincts in appearance but they have issued their decrees under the name of wisdom in general. However, consciously or unconsciously, their wisely issued decrees are dependent on power and relationship between domination and in service of class-dominated, ethnic and sectarian domination. This is confirmed by the alliance between the religious wisdom of holy Zarathustra with the political system and the holy clerics or saints (Farh- e Izadi) of Achaemenid and Sassanid. It was the union set up between Plato's thoughts and the Greece oligarchic political system: the alliance between Mesopotamia myths and the Assyrian/Babylonian Empire. An alliance between the sacred Islamic religious core and the sacred power of caliphate. An alliance between the Holy Medieval Christian theology with autocratic domination. An alliance between the sacred intellect and the metaphorical subject with the modern political system and the exclusion of maniacs from society.

Therefore, in our study of Iranian political reason, we will identify the characteristics of Iranians beyond the domain in which the real / political developments have framed their own shape on the historical matter and it have shaped the unconscious Iranian episteme and the existential structure of Iranian subjects. We deduce issues in accordance with the Iranian's own mindsets and based on their cultural documents, but when we apply the notion of political wisdom, we analyze the characteristics of Iranian reason not from the angle of Iranian mentality but based on post-modern epistemology. Reason originated not only from their class /ethnic interests, but also it has assisted in reproducing that class structure despite repeated discontinuities of history. This rationale taken whether from the way of expressing myth in the ancient world, or from religion in the middle age up to contemporary ideologies have been in the service of the interests of ethnic domination, class structure and the first person of the state and it has both reconstructed and reproduced this structure. Iranian political intellect has imposed impersonal totalities on individual's instinctive lives and also their ethnic domination on subordinates especially Kurds and hindered them out of their liberation under the titles of Ahura, holy and religious, and fighting against Ahriman and AjiDhak, Jinn and Infidels, protecting the borders and destructing Iran enemies out of the surface of earth. Kurds who have resisted in front of the domination of these generalities and have defended their freedom and identity have been negated and denied under the names of Ahriman, Div, Zahhak, pagan (Kafir), beheader, agent of evil or imperialism.

The concept of political ration clears reason from metaphysical sanctity and it reveals the relationship between ration and politics. In this sense, ration is not intrinsic, nor the result of connecting to the source of truth, not the result of killing the soul, and nor the reward of the free souls, but rather it is the indicator of the social and political values and demands of a nation and the justifier of the interests and social order. Therefore, according to Foucault, every truth is a particular formulation of power. Reason, morality, law, theology, and so on are he instrument of domination and at the service of the social order and the class structure of society



and the ideology of preserving the interests. In this research, political knowledge means a system of epistemology and a fixed set of ways of Iranian civilization thinking. Although its form of expression and its content have changed in different periods of time, the set of its rules has remained without discontinuity. The Iranian political intellect has transited from the expressive way of myth to religion and from religion to ideology; however, its epistemological foundations and its main features and characteristics have remained unchanged. Myth and religion are the ideologies of preindustrial societies (Eagleton, 1991, in trans by Ma'sombeygi 1381/2002: 287). The myth in the ancient world has played the same role of ideology in the current times in terms of providing social order and the unity of a nation. The union of political rulers with the priests in the ancient era, the union of Iranian political rulers with clerics and jurisprudents in middle ages, and the unity of political system with intellectuals in contemporary times are all the symbols of Iranian political intellect. It goes without saying that in this research we are not investigating Iranian political ration's epistemological foundations, but ideological products of Iranian intellect. This means that the political wisdom of Iran is not an epistemological function but it is rooted in the structure of political power and its application and all these justifies and legitimizes the structure of the power of ethnic domination, whose characteristics and manifestations of political action all follow from an internal logic. "Political ration is a kind of ration because wisdom dominates these attributes and structures and regulates their relations. On the other hand, it is political because its function is not the production of knowledge but the exercise of power or the expression of its implementation. Political wisdom takes into account the categories and tools of different epistemic systems according to requirements"(Al-Jabery, 1984, in trans by Al-e Mahdi, 1389/2010). Nonetheless, Iranian intellect has had the same epistemological foundation despite its political and ideological breakdowns.

The interests of the Persian tribe/class has been dominant over the Kurds underneath these sacred and canceled political wisdom. The Kurdish being of the political rebellious systems of Medes, Guamata, Mazdakis, Khoramdinan and the contemporary parties have proved themselves in the historical context. Therefore, it is obvious from the reality conditions that the Kurds have not subdued to Iran's symbolic order and political wisdom and they have always been rebellious against the domination of Iran's political intellect which has always justified the domination of the Persian ethnic state. They have defended against the domination of metaphysical / rational holistics from the ecstatic instinct and personal mentality of the individual. For this reasons, the Iranian political ration has named Kurds/ Mithra religion as Ahriman / Div, AjiDhak, Jinn, and so on. Thus, they have had the legitimacy of the domination and suppression and they have fought Kurds under the name of the rule of the truth to repel their devil's miseries. Although the war and struggle between Iran and Kurd has been an ethnic and political war and controversy, it has also been an ontological struggle and controversy between two approaches to life. The struggle of the heaven with the earth, Apollon with Dionysus, intellect (political intellect) with instinct (Logos with Eros), and the law with the human intellect have been manifested in the form two nations of Iran / Persia and Kurd.

However, why do we study Iran's political intellect? Let us hear the answer from Foucault: liberty will not be possible except by invading. Of course, not attacking the results, but attacking the roots of the state's political rationality. The attack on political rationality means criticising the foundations on which they are based and political ration seeks to justify them in every era and every civilization, and gives them legitimacy and rationality (Foucault, cited in

Al-Jabery, 1984, in trans by Al-e Mahdi, 1389/2010). Therefore, our goal, on the one hand, is to criticize the Iranian political intellect, namely the attack on the political foundations of the pars monotheistic government action over the course of history which Iranian political intellect has legitimized and rationalized it in the form of myth, religion, and ideology. The discovery of the meanings of the symbols and myths themselves is at the same time the conceptualization of the political and cultural order, which, due to Iranian / metaphysical domination, there has not been the possibility of its processing.

### Rational Policy

Jaspers (1953, in trans by Lotfi, 1373/1994) speaks about the “axial period” of history which man is still living within its framework. A period that developed with Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, Hindu Buddhism, Greek, and the periods of Jewish prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah. According to Jaspers (ibid), the axial period is the most prolific period of history, the period between the years 800 200 B. C that whatsoever happened before it was an introduction to it, and whatsoever has happened after it traces back to it and during which the kind of humanity emerged that we live with it till now. At that time, the worldly religions that we today live based on them were founded. This universal transformation of man can be called the evolution towards spirituality. The real human being hidden in the prison of the body and entangled in the guise of instincts and desires wishes salvation that he can achieve in this world through either ascending towards thought, or in silence (spiritual tranquility) or while experiencing Nirvana or surrendering to the will of God. Disagreements are very large in terms of thoughts and the content of the beliefs, but the common point is that there is a person who steps beyond ..., in the axial period something emerged which was later called under the name of reason and personality ... . In this era, people of the world are seeing the pestilence of decadence, and through insight, education, and transformation of the situation, they are struggling to come up with a plan to master the flow of affairs. The end of this first period was political, with strong governments dominating their neighbors and becoming greater and more widespread like in China, Marvaid in India, Hellenistic and Roman states in the western world (Achaemenid in Iran, Qaderi) in which the order was established in accordance with a technical and organizational plan ... . Then every ethnic group that did not take advantage of the periodic movements remains in the form of "natural people" as has been in thousands of years before (Jaspers 1953, in Lotfi 1373/1994: 15).

A few important points are hidden in this brief but fruitful words of Jaspers. One is that he considers the pivotal period as the transition from prison of the body and instincts as the evolution towards spirituality. Second, he considers thought transformation towards spirituality as the significant factor in the formation of the great empires, and the third is that every single nation staying away from the periodic axis movements remains as a natural and historyless ethnic group. In the framework of course thinking of the axis period from Zoroaster and Plato until Kant 4, the body and the flesh has become the cage of the soul, and always land, personal life, human intellect and a wisdom has been sacrificed for the sake of general and hollow concepts, heaven, wisdom and morality. While metaphysical wisdom and the emergence of postmodern and post-historical theories, sacred and general concepts turned into smoke sent and the possibility of the emergence of earthly human beings was provided. Foucault correctly identifies spirituality (subject, spirit, and intellect) not as self-oriented, independent cause but

as "the effect of the political anatomy (truth / power) and body imprisonment" (Foucault 1977, in Imami 1378/1999: 42). He considers our freedom (our) flesh life that must be released from social discipline (Merquior 1987, in Azimi 1389/2010). Thus, using posthistoric theories provide the possible potential to make Kurdish practice known and criticise Iranian theories that pivotal period has been the theoretical support for them.

It is in the axial or pivotal period. i.e. in the time of the formation of Mesopotomya civilization, Achaemenid Zoroastrianism, Greek Plato and Jewish, and the Assyrian / Babylonian, Iranian and Greek that Kurds were removed from the scene of the history, and in the words of Olsen (1991), they became a historyless nation, or as Jaspers, in general, said they remained in an ethnic culture. In this regard, Gutians were called unreasonable snakes of the mountains and invaders of the gods' sanctuary or bastard of Tiamat in Semetic / Mesopotamia culture. In the Greek political order, they are considered as cursed snake-haired Medusa, in Jewish political order as Jinn and Satan, and in Christianity, they are termed as "earthly / evil city" of Augustine, even the great emphasis of the religion of Christ was on the Spirit and Spirituality, and the supreme authority for denying the earthly Mithra. The question posed is this why, at a time period and with similar thoughts, did "axial era" start? If thought emerges in response to a crisis, what was the crisis that has urged philosophers and prophets to present a solution?

The ideal society of the Greeks, Ancient Persia, Islamic and Jewish rationalism is based on the hierarchy and division of society into classes that are organized according to the cosmic order and the divine law. The owners of knowledge or their claimant have the right to rule and dominate the majority of the people who are only caring about earning a living. The human being is divided into two divine and divine dimensions in this sort of "political order". Human being is thought as the rebellious horse, the devil and infidel and had to be suppressed in this mainly / instinctive dimension. Terrestrial community was run based on divine law and the owners of knowledge and revelation. In these three civilizations, these are the power and politics which are the known instruments of truth and wisdom. Metaphysics and soul are preferred to the human intellect, the body and the earth prefer and earthly people are referred to as the cave of ignorance, the devil, evil, jinn which in contrast to them, wisdom, Ahura / Imlah, Again (Metaphysical), the sky, the good and the light are constructed. What and what culture and religion have the pivotal period with these characters seen that in contradiction to it religion and philosophy were constructed? this book is an attempt to answer these questions.

In the classical philosophy taken from Zarathushtra and Hammurabi to Plato and Augustine, and up to the period of modernity, we have a transcendental sign and a source of truth independent of the structure of society and the instincts of mankind. This is under the name of the theory of forms (ideas), Ahuramazda, God or reason, which is a criterion for the nature, rules of the political system, and guidance of human life. Thus, the principle is truth and rationality, and the politics and power are the instrument of truth to guide human life and to reach prosperity. Since a few (in Plato, the philosophers, in Islam, the clerics, the Popes in Christianity and kings in the Zoroastrian, etc.) possess the ability to discover the metaphysical truth; hence, only those few have the right to rule over others. Furthermore, in the name of happiness of spiritual and afterlife, they forbid and condemn the true bliss of the earth and bodily pleasures. In classic philosophy politics and power was thought to be the instrument of reason and truth, but in postmodern philosophy this relationship was reversed. In these philosophical theoretical bases, we will illustrate the transition from the metaphysical truth and

the bliss of the hereafter to earthly realm and worldly prosperity, from the philosopher of the king to the theory of social contract in order to prepare the grounds for providing Kurd's phenomenology and the main subject of Kurd, that is, Contract /paradise (Mithra). Mithra / Contract is the transition from the philosopher-Shah to modern democracy and Mitra / paradise is the transition from the heavenly joy and paradise to earthly paradise. The political outcome of the decline of metaphysics, which is discussed by the thinkers in the following, is the emergence of the social contract theory.

### Political Ration

Three concepts.i.e. Marx's ideology, Nietzsche's Apollo and Freud's dream and their logical conclusion in Foucault and Ferecklaff, unlike the classical philosophy, to reciprocate the relationship between reason and politics. In this perspective, which is also our vision in the thesis, identifies the wisdom and truth of all human knowledge as the instrument of domination and the power relation. In this viewpoint, politics has an ontological aspect and the significant principle is power and human knowledge, and metaphysical facts are tools of power or powerdependent devices. Therefore, the rationality is desanctified and the critique of the sky is changed to the critique of the earth, the critique of reason to the critique of politics, the critique of the cosmic hierarchy will become a critique of the social hierarchy because the sacred concepts of rational are rooted in social and political structures. Besides, earth, body / instinct, freedom and human intellect are preferred to the sky, the spirit, and the metaphysical constraints.

These three thinkers interpreted rational and metaphysical sacraments in the form of concepts such as ideology, Apollonia illusions and psychotic dreams are interpreted and wasted the whole system of classical knowledge and its sanctity. They broke down and revealed the relationship of semantic structures with the structure of power and domination. That is what was processing as rational and metaphysical sacredness in classical philosophy was ruled out of sanctity and their roots was found in power structure and ideology. That is, every form of truth is a certain formulation of power and relationship of domination. Thus, by criticizing the metaphysical illusions and devaluing the sacred once again, earth, instinct and human intellect were valued. In short, these three thinkers nterpreted "eternal memories" constructed by the pivotal thinkers as "subjective idles". It means the concepts of God, spirit, spirituality, morality, sincerity, religion, metaphysics, etc. that wer eternal memories in classical philosophy and they were sunk deep into it were nterpreted as the mental idol in the form of concepts such as ideology (false consciousness and meaning in the service of power) in the new philosophy. These mental idols concealed the deep structure of domination and tribal / classic interests and prevented the real bliss in the name of a false happiness.

### Nietzsche

The system of knowledge has always been in the throne in history of philosophy. There is a cosmic wisdom that there is all mysteries of the universe in it, and human beings are defined as conscious and rational-minded entities owning the ability to discover the world's most

important goal and the source of legitimacy and truth was the discovery of that system of knowledge and pre-determined purpose. Modernity replaced the subject with this cosmic wisdom; therefore, the subject is the same theories of ideas of Plato and God in the Christian world. However, as Foucault asserted, it was Marx's first conviction that attacked this system of knowledge. It all meant the knowledge system does not involve travelling deeply into it and build its eternal memory, but this meaning is persuading to reproduce the system of capitalism and the meaning is on the surface not in the depth and it is helping to advance class interests. But Nietzsche made the main move, saying that man is not an intelligence seeker, and knowledge is just a tool to study power. Freud hit the seal of denial on the legend of reason and considered man not a subject of consciousness, but a capsule of energy and instinct. Foucault, in particular, is considering Nietzsche's long and enduring controversy in depth. There is a critique of the ideal depth in Nietzsche's work, that is, the depth of consciousness or the sort of depth that he revealed as the invention of the philosophers" (Foucault 1964, in trans by Jahandida et al 1383/2004: 7). Thus, Nietzsche considers the whole truth, the ethics of reason, from Socrates to Hegel as language art and the instrument of the will of power and under the name of Apollo as dream and illusion that it is due to the weakness of mankind in dealing with the tragic reality of existence. It is a tragic fact that, instead of the illusion of reason and religion, must be welcomed by the Dionysius dance. Therefore, if humanity had the power to really encounter the tragic truth of existence, he would not take refuge in the dream and illusion of wisdom and ethics, or in God and Ahura Mazda, the notion of goodness and theories of forms.

Therefore, we must not understand intellect in general, as completely free terms created from scratch, but we must examine the power of instincts in knowing it (Nietzsche, 1998: 180). Nietzsche believes that all purposes, goals, and meanings are only representation of the transformation of a supreme will which is inherent in all events, and that optimal will is the will of power (Nietzsche, 1377: 180). Thus, the system of knowledge and truth and interpretations are not self-founded, but are dependent on superior intentions. Every truth is an interpretation according to the will. Of course, the desire for power is not the goal that is to be achieved, but merely a coalition of energy and power. Of course, in line with our research, we should recognize the will to power as the will of the power of government and politics at the political level. We consider the military domination and the ethnic power of Persians as the result of the Iranian religion and myths.

With his own specific concepts, Nietzsche made a major breakthrough in understanding political thought and philosophical understanding of man and society. An attitude that led to the emergence of an understanding of political thought, which continued its rationale near thinkers known as modern postmodernism. Nietzsche questioned the ideal of knowledge, truth and justice which caused a deep rotation of these ideals to understand the reality of power and the relation of domination and also made an important change in thinking about the nature of politics and power. This evolution moved on from the self-oriented and idealistic consciousness and its manifestations, such as religion, philosophy and science, to ideology and language games. The evolution that kept going from self-awareness and the subject-orientedness to the death of the author and subjugation of the subject. The evolution that initiated from the truth against the power and the power as the instrument of truth to its reversal, that is, non-separation of the truth and power and the use of truth by the power.

In fact, Nietzsche gave a philosophical foundation to political ideas of Machiavelli. Philosophy is an attempt at understanding real life, being and the will leading to power instead of discussing ideals and values. It tries to explain and do a historic genealogy via accepting domination in the entire history of mankind and rejecting and reforming it instead of a prescriptive look on the foundation of truth.

If, in Greek thought, a goal-oriented approach based on ultimate thoughts and prosperity is directed toward politics, and politics is in the framework of collective morality or an instrument for the realization of the theory of ideas, Nietzsche's philosophical understanding is focused on the relationship of politics and power without a valuing look at everyday life. In this sense, politics is not a tool of happiness, but a result of the power relationship based on domination, and happiness and other values are nothing but the ideology and instrument of power for domination. In fact, these values are an internal form of power and a justification of power in everyday life.

In the medieval religious thought, politics was understood within the framework of religion and theology as the result of the death of man his sin, and it was the means to punish the sinner in the service of theology, and the truth was assumed in front of or beyond it under the direction of politics and power. In the aftermath thought of Nietzsche, politics became an ontological property, and the truth was not in front of it or beyond it but it became a correlative instrument serving it. Theology and any other values were considered as power production in correlation with it.

In modern thought - other than Machiavelli - it is tried to establish the foundations of morality and the legitimacy for the power within the sovereignty - like the thought of Hobbes. There the power must serve the interests of the public and protect the lives and property of man and the concepts of security and order replaces the concepts of theories of ideas and spirituality in the legitimate domination of power over man. However, aftermath thought of Nietzsche attends to the denial of foundations of thics and legitimacy in the framework of central sovereignty, and deals with strategies and productions of power not only within central and state sovereignty, but also in a variety of levels throughout the political, social and everyday life. It means that aftermath Nietzsche, we see a series of thinkers like Gramsci Althusser, Lacan and Foucault, who examine the system of knowledge and culture in terms of power. According to Gramsci, power does not merely exist in the ruling class's violence, it is rooted in the acceptance of a concept of truth and the world belonging to the ruling class, and hegemony, which is a key concept in Gramsci, is the understanding of the power relationship in everyday life and in the most confidential practices of life. The power is not limited to the centralized authority of the state and its violent forces, but exists throughout the whole society and its semantic system, and there is seen a correlated relationship between the system of understanding, intellectuals and power. The government is a mixture of satisfaction and coercion. The state refers to the whole set of practical and theoretical actions that the ruling class by means of which not only justifies and preserves its domination, but also actively obtains the active consent of the dominated classes, and it is hegemony based on cultural domination. Power is defined in terms of sovereignty and intellectual domination, and the masses are drawn to compromise or suppressed by means of intellectual domination. The ideology of the ruling class penetrates within the minds of masses through instruments such as morality, language, religion, and education attracting their satisfaction and the government legitimacy. Therefore, the real power

of the political system is neither in the violence of the ruling class, nor in the coercive power of its apparatus, but in accepting the worldview of the rulers by dominated masses. The ruling class's philosophy passes through a lot of folk's complication making sifts and manifests itself as common sense. This is the philosophy of the masses that they accept ethics, religion, and ordinary behaviors of society (Gramsci, 246: cited in Vincent, 1993). In line with the investigation of this author, it can be said that the domination of the Persians on the Kurds was accomplished not by only using the mere violence but via the Kurds willingly acceptance of their worldview. With concepts such as common religion, civilized nationalism, plurality in unity and shared domination, they try to consolidate their ethnic domination and advance their ethnic interests. Many of the Kurds, under the domination of the Persians' culture, regard themselves as Iranians and they consider struggle for independence as extremism and narrow-mindedness. They have chosen Iran's legal framework for their activities, that is, they have subjugated to Iranism's cultural domination, which is the same as justification of their ethnic domination. Therefore, the first way to get out of the military domination of the ethnic Persian /Iran system is to get rid of the domination of their political intellect.

By using the concept of imaginary experience of Lacan and the way we call ourselves human beings, Althusser identifies the central core of ideology and the characteristic of our attention to the arena of culture and society. Lacan explains the subconscious not based on the suppression of instincts but on the language and the network of signs. The subconscious elements are signs and "I" is socially constructed. For Lacan, subject is understandable through its status in relation to the symbolic system and social communications system. The subject is nothing but the matter of speech. Althusser focuses on the role of language and ideology in subduing subjects. He knows subjectivism as the root of the bourgeoisie ideology. Althusser like Gramsci considers a major ideological aspect for the state. This means that values and supreme culture in pre- Nietzsche thought influenced by Nietzsche and others such as Marx were reduced in the service of ideology. Ideology itself is considered a set of material powers or it is in relation and coordination with power. In this sense, words and meanings themselves are like weapons and anesthetic toxic materials toxic for power struggle. In Althusser's opinion, the ideas and ideologies of an individual are not the product of the discovery of the truth or internal reflection or communication with the extraterrestrial world, but they are the product of the systems and values that the individual believes in and deals with them apparently as ideals to go beyond the real life. In fact, they are nothing but the ideology of the ruling class and the domination system.

Nietzsche criticizes the foundations of Western rationality (Christ and Plato) because he considers them to be influenced by the spirituality and morality of oriental Zoroaster. For this reason, in contradiction to Zarathushtra, who was the messenger of God and spirituality, Nietzsche is the herald of the death of God and the heavenly values and coming down to the earth. In this way, he takes up an axe, with the book "Zarathushtra said so", and he razed the root of the eastern/ metaphysical foundations of the western wisdom.i.e. Zoroastrianism - which imposed morality and spirit on reality and Plato continued his way.

Zoroaster is the Prophet of God, ethics and metaphysics in contrast to the earth, the biological salvation of humankind, and human intellect. In this book, we find that Zoroastrianism, in contrast to the Earthly Mithraism, has constructed the heavenly concepts or the sacred concepts that were processed by other classical prophets and philosophers, such as Plato, in contrast to

the earthly/ fleshlike concepts. Nonetheless, the thinkers (Nietzsche, Marx and ... interpreted these concepts not as sacred but as a rupture of reality and mental idoles and ideology. Dealing with Nietzsche's and Marx's thought rotation ... is important since, on the other hand, Nietzsche knows Zarathustra as the avant-garde of the meta-physical thinking sees in negating the earth; on the other hand, Zarathustra emerged in opposition to the Median Mithra. The emergence of a critique of metaphysical thinking initiating with Zarathustra by Nietzsche is a critique of Iranian intellectual domination on Kurd. The use of Nietzsche's emphasis on earth and instinct is prepar-ing the ground for the conceptualization of the Kurdish political movements.

As we said, Nietzsche, on the one hand, considers the entire human culture from myth to religion and philosophy under the title of Apollo, illusion and dream arising from the rejection of the tragedy of life with Dionysian dance. On the other hand, knows Zarathustra as the initiator of this apollotic illusion and the negation and humiliation of the earth. It can be said that Iranians in dealing with the tragic reality of life have resorted to the dream of myth and religion but Kurds accepted the tragic truth of life with (Dionysian dance: Halparke) instead of taking refuge in the illusion of religion and myth. Therefore, we interpret the whole political wisdom of Iran under the concept of Apollo as deception and illusion, an illusion that comes from escaping from life and reality.

## Marx

Marx was one of the most radical young Hegelians who took the criticism of religion and spirit down to the earth and community. For Germany, the critique of religion is complete and it the foreground of every critique" (Marx, 1843). According to Marx: "man creates religion and religion does not make man ... religion is human's self-awareness who has lost himself ... Religion is the imaginative realization of a human being who has not gained a real truth. Therefore, Marx took the critique of religion as over since we should criticize the conditions that made the religion. He considered religious as a product of social thought (Marx, 1888). Therefore, it is necessary to criticize the land, the politics, the state and finally production and social relations that created the state and religion as both (religion and state) are the symbols of real human alienation.

Hegel's philosophy sacrificed either the state and and reconciled philosophy with religion, but, Marx identifies the religion and the state as "an alienation form of an alien human being from the real world. Marx looks at a philosophical mind as an alienated mind of the world that thinks within the framework of his alienation, that is, a mind that finds out about itself in an abstractive form". (Marx, 1888). Based on Marx's viewpoint, Feuerbach understood religion but did not address its causes (Wolf, 1985: 28). He takes into account the invention of religion not merely an infallible error, but as a response to the dilemmas of life and the alien-ated work as the cause of the creation of religion (ibid, 38). For Hegel and Feuerbach, alienation phenomenon is purely intellectual, but for Marx it is a social and material process (Callinicos, 1983c, in trans by Babaie, 1383/2004). Therefore, he criticized the social conditions of the alienated work and the alienation of man. With ending the domination of the metaphysical and religious totality and the religious alienation, he criticised of the social and economic, and the alienation domination of the worker at the factory in the real bourgeoisie world. Another interesting concept in Marx is that he says that the critique of the sky must change into the



critique of the earth ... that is, meaning is in the service of power and class interests needing all metaphysical facts to convince its domination. Therefore, instead of drawing in metaphysical illusions which have no depth, we must understand and criticize main deep structures that build these facts, that is, the class interests.

Marx defined all the texts (religion, culture, ethics, myth, etc.) as lacking in depth and ideology (meaning in the service of power), he knew the meaning of texts as outside the text, in the deep structure of the interests of the production and the power of production and texts are serving and reproducing it. Furthermore, Marx did not consider the state to be the manifestation of God representing a general interest or as a natural phenomenon, but as a tool with a partial independence for the destruction of the universality of truth and also knew the truth as the reproduction of the interests of the superior class. With the destruction of the universality of truth, Marx established the truth of this world. With the help of Marx's thought, -the critique of the sky should be changed to the critique of the earth, critique of religion to the rights and critique of theology to politics"- we should criticise Islamic / Iranian world of truth (Quranic and Avestan) and reveals the universal truth of domination and their governments. Islamic / Iranian texts lack any depth and meaning and their depth is in the service of the interests of their ethnic domination. However, for the conceptual use of Marx's thought in the study of the Iranian / Zoroastrian / Islamic / Arab state, we have to manipulate Marx's thinking to suit it to Middle Eastern logic. Marx considers the class as the engine of the history and infra-structure of society; the state, the text of religion, culture, myth and ... are superstructure or re-production of the production force base. But in the Middle East, there has never been a government-independent class that the government reflects it. But Marxian model is still applicable because state is rooted in the class of society and it is the instrument of collective interest in society with such a difference that this group is not a class but an ethnic group/a tribe in which states/ the caliphates /empires are the domination tool of the dominant tribal / tribal. The infrastructure of government and texts such as the Qur'an and the Avestan ... are ethnic / tribal interests, and the motor of the history and infrastructure of the community are tribal / tribal interests. The government, religion, and knowledge of Iran are the tools or reproduction of the interests and ethnic domination of Pars. Marx's views on the state were divided into two categories after him whose roots were in Marx's own opinion. One was the instrumental state theory, which Plekhanov and Kautsky advocated, it meant that the government is a bureaucratic executive committee and lacks any independence. The second theory was the theory of relative independence advocated by Gramsci and Poulantzas. Poulantzas considered political and ideological issues not merely as reproductions but as the main components of social relations having a positive role in reproducing superior class process. The capitalist government atomizing the people with a trick of democracy and everybody a single vote hastened the struggle from economy to politics. With this trick, it has atomized the class and has concealed the class struggle. For Poulantzas, the capitalist state disintegrates class unity and forms the atomic unity of the state- nation (Poulantzas, 1978). As we pointed out, in the Middle East, government is not class but ethnicity-based trying to conceal ethnic cleavages by atomizing people in the form of religious or national unity, tribe or nation. The Iranian / Arab government, after consolidation was not merely surface structure but was the main component of social relations that played a positive role in reproducing the ethnic group domination.

## Freud / Lacan

Jacques Lacan is undoubtedly the most important psychologist after Sigmund Freud, the founder and father of psychoanalysis (Homer, 2005: in trans by Tahaie and Ja'fari, 1388/2009: 11). Lacan enriched psychoanalysis by creating a dialogue between psychoanalysis and other theoretical traditions, including phenomenology and existentialist philosophy, structuralist linguistics, and anthropology. Lacan believes that the fundamental meanings are only clarified when they can be balanced and equated with the language of contemporary anthropology and even the most recent issues of philosophy and ... (Bootby, 2001, in San'ati Zade, 1384/2005:30). Lacan's rereading of Freud pointed out series of very novel concepts, i.e. the most important new Lacanian concepts are three fictional, symbolic, and realistic categories.

Freud, in the first place, believes in the two principles of pleasure and father reality in which the child satisfies his instinctive needs without any limitation during the pleasure principle, but then, s/he moves away from the principle of the pleasure time with the limits of society and the father reality and steps into the process of reality limitations. But the transition to reality is not done with desire, but results from external coercion of society. Therefore, a child who is practically and biologically deprived of the principle of pleasure shelters the dream of imagination in the lost paradise of the principle of primary pleasure. Thus, with a little neglect and manipulations, if we look at Freud's theory historically, we can equalize "the dream" with the concept of the Nietzsche's Apollonian, or the symbolic order of the Lacan, and even the Marxist ideology. Nietzsche believes that man took refuge in the weapon of thought because of the weakness of his physical abilities. The whole human intellectual cultures from Socrates to Hegel and Apollonians, is the dream and imagination that mankind resorted to this illusion of apollotic culture as the result of not engaging in real life tragedy. Has taken refuge and considered the whole philosophy, religion, and science to escape from the tragic reality and seeks refuge in dream and imagination and considers the principle of being as a will leading to power. Freud also assumes the dream, which can include the theory of ideas in philosophy, or the God of religion, or a classless society, to be derived from the defect of action and life's remoteness from the principle of primitive pleasure which we inevitably seek refuge in with dream and illusion. Therefore, someones, ethnic groups or people who have been far from the principle of primitive pleasure and the principle of the instinctive nature of humanity, seek refuge in illusion and thought. Marx also identifies the whole of religious / intellectual sacrament as the concept of ideology, that is, meaning in the service of power. It means that metaphysical / rational concepts lack any depth and meaning within themselves, and their meaning is outside and rooted in the structure of politics and class structure, that is, it is the construction of power relations, and if there were no class divisions, mankind would not suffer the illusory prosperity and ideology illusions or false awareness. Thus, with the intellectual rotation that these three great thinkers created in the history of thought, the inverse relationship between politics and reason came back to its place, and the reason and its essentials were recognized as the tools of domination. It means Iranian rationality (religion, mythology, or nationalism) and the ideology of ethnic Persian domination, i.e. meaning are in the service of ethnic power and is derived from the departure of the principle of primary pleasure that the Kurds are living in it. For this reason, Žižek considers racism to be a lack of sexual desire and jealousy towards its possessors. That is why Kurd is the subject of racism in the Middle East, and perhaps the whole of history.

Freud divides the sensory system of human personality into three parts: id, superego and ego, ie the instincts, which is the reservoir of drives or instincts in close connection with two other areas, namely id and superego. Id is a life sustaining part of personality for the psychoanalysis and is responsible for the mediation of the instincts and superego - morality and ... - and the connection with the outside world is also one of id's duties that psychologists base their therapeutic goal on it. Despite this, Lacan, upon entering the psychoanalytic movement, gave a different theory concerning instinctive id (Movally, 1383/2004: 18). In his opinion, instinctive id is derived from an image that the mirror presents him. He considers Freudian ego as the primitive and pseudo-form of the imaginary category. During this period, that is, the development of the psyche, between six months of age and two, the main lines of childish ego are formed in replicating the perceptual unity of the body image (Bootby, 2001, in San'ati Zade 1384/2005: 33 ). Instinctive id is the result of the child's wishful desires towards the best part of his/her existence. However, this best is nothing but a deceptive curtain on the defect and lack of his being, because its original function is essentially false and due to the neglect and lack of trust of the individual towards oneself. Sensual id is a mirage of self-fascination, that is, narcissism, and insistence on it reveals nothing but its destructive essence. This destruction first of all affects its own self characterized by violence and aggression and it is often projected and targets others. The others here is not an element other than the image of a person deprived of his own image of the outside world (Movally, the same: 19). Whatsoever Lacan calls is the same ontological rapture or the primary lack inside our subjectivity. This lack is subjectivityoriented; it is the sum of the imaginative issue and the realm of distortion and illusion: the realm in which ego tries fruitlessly to obtain an imagined unity and cohesiveness. (Homer, 2005: in trans by Tahaie and Ja'fari, 1388/2009: 52). Perhaps Kurd never abstracted to the subject level of history because he did not experience ontology gap between language and nature, the spirit and body, Eros and logos. In spite of the ontological gap, the Iranian igo is constantly in the illusion of the unity and cohesion of the so-called "Iranian" peoples, in order to bridge its in-ternal gap. The ensual id which the mirror gives a picture of it is a good idea in my study or the subject of Kurd that defines and formulates its own thinking in front of the mirror of the Iranian ration; this an inadequate image of the lack of existence and the result of neglect. The Kurd is unaware that this image is not his own, but the neglect of himself and the diminution of his existence; it is like an image of genuine Iranian and Aryan.

But the symbolic thing is perhaps the vaguest order among triple orders because it extends to everything from language to law and all social structures. The symbolic thing is the constructor of the vast majority of what we usually call reality. It is non-personal framework of the community. As Lacan himself said we are alive beause of this symbolic thing. The subject is created in the symbolic system and language determines it (Myers, 2003, in Nowrozi, 1385/2006: 40-41). It is the structure of the language which speaks through the subject, not vice versa. (Homer, 2005: in trans by Tahaie and Ja'fari, 1388/2009: 67 onwards). Two imaginative and symbolic categories with a third one called "the reality thing" constitute three angles of a triangle. It is the category that Lacan retains mysteriously in a horizontal unobtrusive way which always remains unimaginable and unrecognizable and do not embraces any kind of representation (Bootsby the same, 34). The word is a reality thing before being fragmented by the language. The reality thing preceds the symbolic one and it is the remnant of the symbolic thing, that is, what remains after the symbolic process is complet-ed. It is the surplus that remains and cannot stand being overlooked (Myers, 2003, in Nowrozi, 1385/2006:

47). In fact, it is not reality itself. For Lacan, it includes symbols and implication processes and it is an unknown thing that is present on the boundary of this social world. It is the supporter of social reality which cannot exist without it and at the same time it destroys it. It is an "absolute being" or a "being in itself". Indeed, in contrast to two imaginary and symbolic things, "it is something that remains in its place. It is presymbolic thing that we have no way to symbolize it. Social reality is created through the process of removal and symbol-making (Homer, the same: 114-115). Indeed, in the context of the current research, Kurd is the reality that remains incoherent and unconscious, and can not stand the symbolic order. Iranian social reality and political existence cannot exist without the reality thing of Kurd; however, at the same time it constantly destroys the social reality of Iran. Kurd is presymbolic; thus, it was named the genius and the devil ... and so on.

The Kurds have maintained the principle of pleasure with their living experience and they have not withstood the logic of reality so that they need the myth dream, religion, and philosophy. In fact, the Kurds have embraced the tragic reality of the universe with Venezi's life and happiness - Helperkeh - since they did not necessarily need Apollo's illusion of religion and philosophy; therefore, they have rioted against religion, the class structure and culture of Apollo's Persia / Sami intellectuals from Zahak to Khurdamin with earthly passions, dance, dionism joy and sexual freedom. In the case of the Lacanian reality and symbolic thing, it can be said that the Kurds are the reality things who have not accepted the symbolic order of historical metaphysical rationality originating from the pivotal period. From the point of view of Lacan, for being human, we have to enter the symbolic order. The Kurds did not enter the symbolic order, so they were nicknamed Jin, azhidahac and devil. Lacan says social reality can not exist without reality. At the same time, social reality develops on the basis of the negation of the reality. Indeed, the reality thing destroys social reality. Kurds do not exist but all of the Iranians' existence have evolved based on the negation of the Kurds. The foundations of Iran's existence, whether with the myths of Fereydoun, or with historical Cyrus and metaphysical Zoroaster, were developed depending on Kurd's religious and military negation. It all means that the Iranian social reality was developed on the basis of the reality thing of Kurd negation. Unlike the other nations, the Kurds did not accord to the symbolic order of Iranian intellect and did not define their identity in front of the Iranian intellectuals mirror eventually reducing to the Jens and the unknown domain of reality. Only those that can pass the reality or symbolic order and become the owners of history who get away from their own nature. But the tragic nature of the Kurds, instead of giving way to the logic of reality, remained loyal to the principle of its nature. Therefore, the cut-off Iranians from the principle of primitive pleasure and the true human nature, possessed the dreams, illusions, myth and history; in contrast, the Kurds loyal to the principle of primitive pleasure and the true nature of mankind were called the reality thing, tragedy, and historyless. Lacan mirror can be understood as the gods of the Greek Olympus, Plato's theory of ideas, Zoroaster's Ahuramazda, Althoufer's ideology, and Foucault's discourse, which forms the imaginary identity of the subjects. Referring to the concept of the imaginary experience of Lacan, Althusser considers how we call ourselves the human being as the central core of ideology and the characteristic of our entry into the realm of culture and society (Khaleghi, 1382/2003: 228). Since the Kurds have not defined themselves against the mirror of the history wisdom and the initiators of history, i.e. Iranian, Sami, and Greek nations, they were deprived of access to the domain of culture and society, and they were termed as the Jens and devils.

## Michel Foucault

Michel Foucault is the sunset of Western rationality; the rationality that arose with Plato, and in the enlightenment of German nationalism, it reached its peak of glamour which at the same time was the beginning of technology, and ended in the experience of Auschwitz, Budapest 1958, May 1968. The kind of rationality which was based on the dualism of earth / sky, instinct / reason, pleasure / morality and soul / flesh. The mission of Foucault was to sacrifice one of the aspects of the West Bank (intellect, idealism, ethics and truth), in the favor of its other facet, the liberation of the individual. Kant knew the conflict of instinct/sensuality / and intellect / ethics as inherent in humanity. "The moral man must go beyond the nature of its existence, and in fact, submits to denaturalization" (Smith, 1967: 51). Nevertheless, the contradiction between reason and instinct in Hegel is a historical one that will be solved with the development of history in the synthesis of contemporary civilization. Reason and nature are not face to face in the Hegelian system, but they are two interdependent components (self consciousness is the same as tendency and desire (Hegel, 1807, in Jabali 1382/2003: 382). He established a relation between Bentham's partisanship and Rousseau and Kant peoples' collectivism, and he considered the desire and intellect to be interconnected (Kashi, 1381/2002: 8/105). Marx's historical materialism also reduced rationality and realization to the fulfillment of the biological needs of human such as food and clothing, and sacrificed heaven, intellect, morals and spirit for the sake of earth, instinct, pleasure and flesh. Following the same path from Germany's critical philosophy to Adorno, Foucault criticized the domination of the general principles of reason and ethics on individual biology, since he did not pay attention to the conversion of theory and practice but to the collapse of theory in practice (Merquior, 1987, in Azimi, 1389/2010: 124). He does not regard massacre (the truth) as the lighthouse of the liberation of the salvation of man but as imprisoned in the claws of the power (ibid: 208). That is why the massacre of it (truth) culminated the enlightenment as to the touch" (ibid: 223). For this reason, he roots out the individualization and subjectivity, that is, the internalization of the general principles of reason, ethics, and eternity in the subject and the spirit (the subject, the intellect itself), not like Descartes and Kant and Hegel, as self-founded and independent, nor like Marx, as the producer, and not like Hobbes as the power agent. He, in fact, considers it like the political anatomy (truth / power) and the body's imprisonment (Foucault, 1972, in Valiani, 1388/2009). He knows the liberty, not as something spiritually or mentally, but as our bodily life that must be freed from social principle (Merquior, ibid: 143). Foucault examines the trends in which rationality (the truth of the ethics of the humanities) is made and applies to the human subject. From his point of view, human and social sciences and the whole truth are part of the process of exercising power and domination relations over human beings (Dryfeus, 1983, in trans by Bashiria, 1379/2000: 15). Therefore, to liberate a person, one must leave aside the dream of the truth. The truth is not the rewards of liberated soul not the child of seclusion and isolation, the truth is something belonging to this universal; it is merely a product of necessity and power types and it causes the power to have its influences systematically. Power can only in conjunction with the concept of truth: ((Shirt, 1392). All the facts of each society are a special formulation of the power and domination of that society. The Persians have exercised their power through the production of truths such as plural, ultraethnic Iran and Iranian aboriginal Kurds. We need to understand the trends that have constructed Iranian rationality in relation to Persian power utilizing Foucault's theoretical foundations.

Foucault, in his researches, addresses the subject's objectification in social / cultural divisions, which explains how the subject becomes the subject of research and technology of power; he identifies the wise man and the universe (subject, soul, consciousness) as the product of the siege of power / knowledge technology or disciplinary technology of power. As the Iranian brave Kurd is the product of Persian power / knowledge technology; power / knowledge that exists not only in the sovereignty but also in colleges, schools, television and the entire community.

Foucault's critical philosophy is not anti-individualism but anti-monopolization, and that it liberates man from the state and the individualization (subjection) of a set of government powers (family power, physician, psychiatrist garrison, employer, school, etc; to do this, we must raise new forms of subjectivity out of this imposed sort of subjectivity (ibid: 353). Thus, Foucault is the continuation of western rationality, modernism, and also breaking of it. In fact, "breaking is in the continuation of modernism" attempts to save individual and its life from the domination of general principles (ethics and reason) through political ration (the interrelationship of reason, ethics, and knowledge with the technology of discipline and power). To do this, it reveals the relationship between rationalization and political power (power / knowledge) (ibid: 345) which has created a new form of domination, subjugation and subjectivity (Dreyfus, 1983, in Bashiria 1379/2000:324). The purpose of this research is to critique the rationality of politics (Myth, Religion and Science) which has led to the unification of Kurdish subjects; the critique of the concepts of the construction of Persian intellect, such as Iran's metaphysics, the multinational government. ... have broken down Kurdish people, the Kurdish collective and ethnic identity which like a mirror has shaped Kurdish subject.

Foucault, finally, focuses on the analysis of the political siege of the body and technology. He considers the spirit (subject, psyche) not as a metaphysical and independent entity, but as an offspring of punitive methods of care and compulsion, and he knows this spirit not as the essence ... but as the facilitator through those relations of power that leads to the knowledge that makes the effects of power continue ... . The human subject who we are called to liberate is the result of subjugation, and the spirit that gives existence to it itself is a piece of power that dominates the body The soul is the effect and the instrument of the political anatomy and it is the prison of body. ((Foucault, 1972, in Valiani, 1388/2009.: 40).). Compare the pivotal period and Zo-roastrianism on the spirit with the earthly living of Mitra ... Refer to the following texts, Mitra and the Iranian constructed subject, who the agent role has been injected on it ignoring the fact that the Iranian subject his the effect of subjugation and Persian domination.

Thus, Foucault, chalanges the agent subject of Hobbes's power, the subject of the truth discoverer of Descartes and Kant, and the subject of the Hegelian and Marxist incentive of history, and does not considers the truth as the reward of free souls or derived from the inner reflection, but imposed by social discipline. Therefore, the compass of Foucault's work is not the subject and the truth, but the power and its strategies; the power which is not limitator but productive, and its largest productions ect.are truth and subject. Therefore, Persian one-ethnic government produces truths such as Ahura Mazda and Zel Al-Sultan (the Shadow of the God), and the national identity and the Iranian Kurd, etc., which imposes its power. . All Iranian truths are the formulation of power and privileges of the ethnic group Persian superior class.

In Foucault's opinion, the image of king / shepherds in the thought of the ancient East originated from Assyria and Palestine to Babylon. The word "shepherd" was not only used special to the kings but also addressed to the gods. This simulation between the monarchs and the gods gives a similar role to both of them through the word of the shepherd. Since the flock they are leading is the same. The thoughts of the Hebrew- Jews – has extended the usage of the concept of "The Shepherd and the cattle" and has devoted to it a distinctive feature. Je-hovah is the only shepherd of his nation and they have no other shepherd but only in one case when God required David to collect cattle (sons of Israel). With founding the kingdom, David became known as the shepherd. The journey of departure in addressing Jehovah says : Thou lead your people with the hand of Moses and Aaron like a herd of sheep. In Foucault's view, the relationship between God and man is mediated by the earth in Greek thought, but in the middle east there is no mediator between the god of shepherds and her herd. Relationship is non-intermediate; the shepherd god gives to the herd the promise of land. In the thought of the ancient East, the shepherd is the guarantor of the deliverance of the herd. Eating and drinking of the herds is related to the attention of the shepherd. This is the concept of divine protection in the thought of the ancient East. The shepherd in the ancient East thought acts based on sincerity unlike Greece that acts depending on duty. Foucault, further, added that that Christianity, not the Greek concept, entered the Eastern concept of shepherds and flocks into Europe. Power in the European community is based on alien technology, which is based on dealing with the absolute majority of people as a herd guided by a group of pastors. Foucault will refer to an important point that "freedom is not achieved except through invasion. Of course, not an attack on the results but on political rationality Attack on political ration means criticism of the bases on which the political action of the state is based and gives it legitimacy and rationality (Foucault, cited in Al-Jabery, 1984: 60). Foucault, in pursuit of the paleontology of the concept of shepherd and herd, points out that contemporary West-ern democracies, behind their glittering appearance, utilize an obsessive and strange technology for imposing power. A technology based on some of the shepherds who manage the absolute majority of the inhabitants and deal with them as flocks. We, as Jaberi says, do not essentially need such a paleontology in the Iranian world and in the Eastern societies to clarify that the reality of power is based on a well-known technology (Foucault, *ibid*).

The cited item can be compared with the words of Cyrus in the cylinder and Darius in the inscription that know themselves as representative of Ahura Mazda / Marduk and the rest of the nations as their servant and they know themselves as the owner of the good land and good herd and defeated nations on behalf of Ahura Mazda / Mardak. The Iranian thought is also under the framework of the ancient east which Foucault referred to as the "herd shepherd". Islamic / Iranian thinkers, like Nizam al-Mulk and Ghazali, explicitly liken the king to the shepherd and the people.

Cyrus explicitly described his rule as the shepherd, and described the king as the herd: Cyrus was plainly accustomed to saying that a good king was no different from "a competent shepherd." Since a shepherd takes advantage of his flock, he cares them. A king also obeys his own subjection; therefore, he provides happiness for them (Xenophon (n.d), in trans by Karimi, 1350/1971: 258).

In the epitome of his tomb, Darius says that that he is the great god Ahoura Mazda ... who created happiness for the people and sent down the wisdom and seriousness to Darius. Darius

is the symbol of the intellect and seriousness, and the people are the symbol of joy (Hinz, 1969, in trans by Rajabi, 1385/2006). Thus, wisdom must also dominate instinct and happiness classic inpolitical ration.

In the Babylonian cylinder discovered in Babylon's drills in 1879, containing 45 rows, Cyrus named himself the Shah of the World and chosen of Marduk, the Great God, for sovereignty over the world, the Great King of the World ... Mereduk returned ... He found the just prince and took his hand as he wished. Cyrus, king of Anshan, announced that he called himself king of the whole world. He commanded him that the land of Gutu (present-day Kurdistan) would kneel down to his feet. He defeated the bands of Mendehe Uman Mendehe are the remenant of Meds ... All the people of Babylon, Sumer, Akkad, and ... knell down and against him and kissed his feet ... all of kings of the world brought me a huge tarif and kissed my feet." Darius the Shah says, "By the will of Ahuramazda, I am king and Ahasmazda gave me the kingdom ... I was asked to be king by Ahamada: Elamites, Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Medi and ... they are all my servants and followed me via the request of Ahuramaz-da. They gave me tribute to what they were told to do, whether it was night or day. A man who was loyal to these writings very well. "... I rewarded him, and he whoever was hijacked, I punished. These writings showed relation of the lord / the farmer, the shepherd / Iranian herd of flies. In contrast to other people, Persians conceived themselves as the true religion and representative of Ahura Mazda and the good idea and considered all their opponents, Ahriman and Dave, inevitably Persians find themselves as a shepherd who knows the right path and defeated nations as herds that they must obey them.

Another concept is Foucault's theory of discourse. Discourse represents the explanation of the language beyond the sentence, words and phrases, and should be sought in non-verbal symbols and actions and all communications between the individuals. Foucault argues in this regard tha discourses come from signs, but their function is more than the use these signs to show and select objects. It is the same characteristic that makes them irreducible in language, speech, and Speaks ". Therefore, discourses are the illustration of the meaning and social con-nections of individuals and through them, the world is understood differently; in other words, discourse is, according to Foucault, the difference between what can be properly said in a certain period (according to the grammatical and logical rules) and what is actually said. One of the features of Foucault's thinking is that he measures the discourses according to their application, and else he defines them in relationship with power. He studies discourses, not because of their semantic meanings, but to understand the context in which they are con-veyed, and the transformations that discourses are developed based on them. In other words, Iranian political intellect lacks any depth, and what is important is the use of Iranian intellectuals which is nothing but fostering peoples to serve the lord and the godfather. Another is the situation in which the discourse of Iranian intellectuals is born, and that is the oriental tyr-anny and class structure and ethnic rule.

In discourse, the materials expressed, the statements and the theorems, the words and phrases used and their meanings all depend on the fact when, Where, How, By whom or against what or who, and with what motive and intention the stated statements, the positive and negative propositions, and the hypothetical theorems are designed and formulated? (Massoudnia, 1391). In fact, in discourse, the communication of the text with its social and political context is known. For example, the link between the text of the inscription of Bisotun and its political context and its political function is obvious. The concept of lies is addressed to the political



opponents and the power owner ethnic group introduces itself as the representative of the truth. Its political function is to legitimize itself and to deny legitimacy from “the other” opponent as the same role of today's Islam in justifying the rule of the Islamic Republic.

Another notion that is very important in Foucault's theory is that power is neither restrictive nor repressive, but it is contributing and productive. Power involves tools for the creation and accumulation of knowledge developing spaces within which knowledge is formed and truths and knowledge are the effects of power. This is of particular use in the way Iran is dealing with Kurdish people, especially in the contemporary time. It means that Iran's political wisdom did not ignore, reject and suppress Kurd in contrast to Arab and Turk intellectuals, but rather focused on the formation of Kurd's political minds and deeds. For this reason, some Kurds speak about Kurds being as Iranians and trying to link their history with Iran's history since they have been absorbed by Iran's discourse and power.

Another important argument emphasized by postmodernists especially Foucault is that all these discourses are developed for the domination and preservation of a unified identity and the domination of equalities on differences. To do so, every identity and each political ration needs its corresponding one. According to our hypothesis, the political intellect of Iran has been shaped based on the negation of “the other”- Kurd - during history. This “the other” was zahak and Turanians at the time of the myth addressed to the Medes and the last king of the Medes. In the historical and ancient times, it was Gaumatha and Frevertish who were non-Iranian according to the Zoroastrianism itself and the inscriptions of Bisotun written by Dariush. NonAvesta are demons and devils that are addressed to the Median mithra. They are Kurds in the contemporary era, both in the Iranian Shah's regime and Islamic Iran. Finally, I must point out that Foucault's madness and civilization book is a good model for writing this book in which Foucault explains three different periods for the development of contemporary civilization and modern rationality on the basis of non-madness and madness. He investigates and compares the form of expression and speech of each era about crazy and madness. In addition, I surveyed on the expressive form of Iranian political and civilization in three form of myth, religion, and ideology in dealing with Kurdish issue. Thus, “The other” of Iranian rationality is Kurd in the form of the concepts of evil, divine and jinn.

Another notion in Foucault's ideas is paleontology, that is, one of Foucault's key words in the formulation of the formation of knowledge and knowledge of mankind during the West history and, in general, it is about the ways of formation of social and humanity sciences. Foucault put this term against historicism. Words “historicism and archeology” can enlighten our understanding of this method, i.e. paleontology.

Archeology is literally a method of studying history involving excavating and extruding artifacts from underground which is similar to archology to a degree. In other words, Foucault's philosophical paleontology is somehow similar to paleontology. "Indeed, Foucault wants to highlight minor issues, events, and incidents which less attention has been paid on them. In other words, he wants to find the unique, unforgettable, and forgotten nature of each occurrence among the old dusted documents, and among all those searches. In this research, I intend to address the marginal and minor problem to highlight the unique, distinctive but forgotten character of the Kurds among the dusted documents. In fact, we excavate Kurd history from under the dust of Iran.

In this sense, the paleontology does not investigate questions about the nature and identity of man and the phenomena in the universe in the same old ways as before. In general, paleontology disagrees with any kind of generalization and systematization; it wants to examine the same everyday event that are considered banal.

Foucault publishes his influential but controversial book, that is, *Words and Things or the Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences* (1966), in which he examines the method of archaeology. Archaeology, in contrast to conventional research methods, is a different method in historical research and it is carried out at a different level. In this book, Foucault takes the concepts common in traditional history, such as progress, continuity, and stability out of discussion and emphasizes on epistemological degeneration instead. In this book, he establishes discourse and discourse relations as the basis for his analysis. In other words, Foucault claims that Archaeology speaks about the conditions of the development and the possibility of the emergence of human sciences.

Before that, Foucault spoke about the conditions and the possibility of the conceptual emergence of a new epistemological term called “human”. In his view, the connection between words and things in the new age has led to the emergence of this epistemological phenomenon. We can say that the archaeological results of Foucault's neologism in this work are the followings:

1. Emphasis on epistemological ruptures instead of concepts such as progression, continuation, and continuity
2. The emergence of the concept of episteme or the formation of knowledge
3. The emergence of a new concept of man as the subject and object of power and knowledge
4. Emphasizing the issue of discourse and discourse relationships rather than emphasizing the study of social and cultural, and political institutions

It is evident that Foucault uses archaeology as opposed to hermeneutics, since archaeology, unlike hermeneutics, does not seek to discover and analyze the semantic meanings of the text, but rather to the level of discourses. For example, Foucault, in the book, “*Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity or Madness in the Age of Reason* (1961)”, tries to put forward the silence archaeology on the subject of madness. There, Foucault is trying to express the question of how the maniacs, who lived peacefully alongside other people in the past, they got out of the social circle with the advent of modern reason-based civilization, and the same modern wisdom silenced them in the community and left them isolated. Also, at the birth of the clinic, he analyzes the medical view concerning the individual's body. In this book, he also examines paleontology of the humanities in the ordering the objects.

Genealogy has a wider scope than archaeology, and its main axis is the interrelations between systems of truth and power aspects. In other words, the origin of Foucault's genealogy is based on a specific conception of power, knowledge, truth, and the relationship between these concepts.

In post-1970s, Foucault not only does deal with discursive rules, but also emphasizes on nondiscursive relationships, social institutions and their associations with knowledge. Foucault's goal in genealogy is to reach this question of how human beings become the subject

of knowledge and power through the network of knowledge-power relationships. Foucault, however, has the same historical attitude in both methods; he speaks of dispersion and diversion instead of the point of origin and initiation. Paleontology links the ways of the emergence of human sciences and their possibilities conditions with power technologies embodied in social practices. This book has examined the development of Iranian knowledge and religion in connection with the ethnic domination of Pars on the Med.

#### Furcklaf

Norman Frecklef emphasizes the active role of discourse in building the social world. But Farcool, in contrast to Laclow and MoF - who considered everything as discourse and there is nothing out of the discourse. He insists that discourse is merely one of the different aspect of every social practice. The distinction between discourse and non-discourse is one of the survivors of traditional Marxism in Freckleton's theory, which makes the critical discourse analysis have less post-structural approach than the Laclow and Mof discourse theory. Furclauf make a distinction between discourse and other dimensions of social practices (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, in trans by Hadi-ye Jalili, 1389/2010: 26). A discourse's practice is one of the aspects or dimensions of any socialist practice having dialectical relations with other dimensions of that social practice, that is, some aspects of the social world act according to logics that are different from those of discourses and should be studied with a tool other than discourse analysis. The discursive practice reproduces the other dimensions of social practice as much as other social dimensions formulate the discursive dimension (*ibid.*, 45). In other words, discourse is a type of social practice that builds both the social world and is built by other social practices. Discourse simply does not help to formulate and transform the social structures of the discourse but also it reflects them (*ibid.*, 111). Discursive construction of community is not the product of free performance of ideas in the minds of individuals, but it is a product of the social practise deeply rooted in material and real social structures (Fairclough, 1992b: 66). In critical discourse analysis Freckles claims that discourse practices have an ideological function that helps create and reproduce the unequal power relations between social groups - for example, between social classes, women and men, minorities and ethnic majority. In contrast to discourse theorists such as Foucault and Laclow and Moff, critical discourse analysis at this point does not entirely distance itself from the Marxist tradition. In Foucault's attitude, the power of the productive force creates the subjects and agents, but in the Marxist attitude, power is in the possession of the individual or individuals and can use it against the other. Critical Discourse Analysis also employs the concept of ideology in order to theorize the domination of a social group over other social groups. Fairclough's discourse analysis is critical in that it intends to reveal discursive practices in the preservation and survival of the social world including those social relations that are inextricably linked with the power relations so that it can help more appropriate social changes. Therefore, critical discourse analysis is not politically neutral, it considers itself to be a critical approach that is politically committed to change and it can take side with the socially excluded groups under the title of "liberation. This critique intends to reveal the role of discursive acts in preserving the unequal power relations in such a way that take the result of the analysis of critical discourses in the service of radical change; Furkauf attends to enlightening criticism only to achieve this purpose (Jorgensen and Philips, 2002, in trans by Hadi-ye Jalili, 1389/2010: 115).

In contrast to linguistic approaches which focus entirely on the analysis of the text and has a simplistic conception of the relation between the text and the community, from Furkauf's viewpoint, pure text analysis is not sufficient for the analysis of discourse and does not give us an insight into the link between text and structure and social processes. Thus, we need an interdisciplinary perspective that integrates text analysis and social analysis. As the result, this perception that discourse is both constructive and product of other social phenomena has played a central role in Fairclough's theory (ibid). The method of Furkauf's discourse analysis will release the author from the limitations of Foucault and Laclou and Mauff and it does not distant away much of Marx's approach that identifies the structure of economic inequality as the main cause of stimulating history and shaping the ideology.

It can be said that the application of this analysis in relation to Iran has been very influential in the reproduction and continuity of Iranian discourse apart from the discourse practices of Iranian intellect with the aforementioned characteristics and production of its texts, and nondiscourse social practices of its class structure - which the dominant Pars ethnic group has been the superior class. As the Iranian discourse with the central sign of Farah Izadi and other features mentioned above leads to the reproduction of the class structure and aristocracy in Iran, the same social practice and its hierarchy has helped to produce and reproduce and remove other anti-Iranian discourses. This is not merely the power of Iranian discourse intellect to reproduce it even in the contemporary period since today's democracy-seeking discourses has a far more hegemony and legitimacy than Iranian rational discourse; nonetheless, why is Iranian rational discourse still dominant and reproducing in the 21st century which is the century of secularism and democracy? Because - as Lambton also points out - the Iranian lord-serf hierarchical social structure has remained largely unchanged. The Iranian class social practice has not only contributed to the reproduction of its traditional wisdom but also it has led to the removal of other anti-Iranian discourses; therefore, the secret of the continuation or reproduction of its hierarchical structure is the preservation of hegemony and the domination of the superior Pars class-ethnicity. This discourse has not given equal status to other ethnicities except in slogans and the preservation of Persian domination on other ethnic groups has led to a long-lasting hierarchical structure in Iran. Discourse is not just text and it must be developed in social structure. Thus, modern democracy-based discourse has nothing to do not only with the metaphysical mind of the Iranian rational, but also with its social and aristocratic structure and the discourse of ethnic Persian domination. Therefore, the Iranian political rational is reproducing domination as much as it is itself a product of it with this difference that we should replace the domination of Persian ethnic group and monotheistic state instead of the dominance of the capitalist class in Iranian intellectual discourse. The ideology of Iranian intellect is both rooted in the structure of Pars's ethnic domination and it also helps to reproduce it.

Another point regarding the importance of Fairclough is that he considers his model to be critical and revolutionary and allows the author to move from ideological discourse to nonideological discourse. He finds himself critical of ideological discourse, justifier of the unjust class structure and defender of classes, ethnic groups, marginalized and subjugated people of society. Inevitably, it is possible to defend the emancipation and revolution and the change in critical discourse analysis of Frekball. Therefore, it is possible to use the discourse's conceptual framework and approach to examine Iran's history and to remain loyal to the emancipation and aspiration of the liberation of another nation. The principle behind the formation of discourse theory, as Derrida also referred to in Foucault's critique, is the critique

of individual domination (the critique of an ethnic domination over other ethnicities) and the belief in the ideal of liberation and negation of domination. Only discourse writers define freedom negatively and not positively in order not to make Rousseau and Marx's mistakes. Therefore, there is no contradiction between our – Kurds – use of discourse analysis framework to criticize Iranian domination on other nationalities and our belief in the freedom of the Kurds; rather, it is this belief in freedom that has led us to utilize discourse analysis to criticize Iranian political domination over Kurdish identity.

### Roland Barthes

Barthes considers the myth as a "politically discarded" speech, meaning that the myth turns a historical intent into nature and immortality. As the ideology of the bourgeoisie is characterized by escaping the name of the bourgeois, myth is based on the loss of the historical quality of things: things in myth lose the memory of their own creation. What the world gives to myth is a historical and certain historical fact that comes into the language through the mode of production or human action. In return, the myth gives a natural image of this reality; a kind of magic occurs in which the reality is gone and its history is evacuated and the nature is besprinkled instead. Therefore, the function of myth is to hollow out reality. Myth does not deny things, its function is, conversely, to talk about things. Simply put, it refines them, makes them innocent turns them into immortality. The myth attracts complexities and organizes a world without contradiction. However, defining myth as politics-ridden speech, Barthes believes that there is a speech that stands against myth, that is, a speech that remains political. Speech of a productive man: Everywhere man speaks for the transformation of reality and not for changing it into an image, the myth is impossible. Hence, a one hundred percent revolutionary language cannot be a mythical language. The revolution remains political both at the beginning and at the very end, not as a speech myth, which at first is political, and at the end natural (Barthes, 1957, in trans by Daghighian, 1375/1996). Therefore, for Barthes, myth is not just the productions of the old societies. The mentality of today's societies has also an astonishing ability to make the myth of everyday social and political events. It can be said in Eagleton words that myths are the ideologies of pre-industrial societies, or the ideologies are the myths of industrial societies. Both the myth and the ideology are symbolic semantic worlds with social functions and implications (Eagleton, 1991, in trans by Ma'sombeygi, 1381/200). Kurds in Iranian mythology are defined as brain-eater Zahak, and in modern ideology as headcutter Kurd. The writings of Roland Barth are very useful in the study of Iranian mythology as the Achaemenid took power out of the Medes through political action and war, but this power transmission is illustrated very innocent and natural in mythology. The political root of this transformation has been concealed as if the Medes has submitted the power to Cyrus optionally. The Iranian myths have negated the root cause of the violence in the formation of the Iranian Empire and they have taken it as divine destiny and the will of the Medes themselves. Another important point in Roland Bart's is that all speeches are not myths, only image-making speech is mythical. Nevertheless, a speech which seeks to change the world through action and revolution and not through image-building is a political and revolutionary one. It can be considered as true about Kurds that they have never transposed to the world of myths and has always been involved with the world and trying to change it not with the language of image and spirit, but with revolutionary action and rebellion.

What we were trying to offer in this section was the passage from the eternal memory to the mental idol. The metaphysical concepts that mankind had lived with for centuries was nothing but the mental idiosyncrasies and the facilitator of the wheel of power and the consolidation of domination. The sacred concepts of Ahura Mazda, religion, land of Iran, cultural Iran, unity and ... are not the eternal memories we drawn within it, but the mental idiosyncrasies and ideology of domination of the dominant ethnic group of Fars. On one way, we should challenge the theoretical foundations of these concepts and its historical foundations on the other way which both require each other. We challenge the philosophical foundations of Iranian metaphysics in this chapter and its historical foundations. in the next chapters. A history that has not been the evolution and the inward relationship between Pars and Kurd but the reproduction of the Persian political issue and Persian domination on Kurd in the form of holy concepts every time.

### Pre-rationality Era

We expressed the emergence and decline of irrational philosophical rationality in the first part of the book. In criticizing the civilization, we found what had become famous under the name of rationality was nothing but metaphysical or ultrarationalist beliefs known under the title of ration. In this section, we deal with the pre-metaphysical rationale which is the same real and human intellect. The metaphysical history from Zarathustra and Plato until the Nietzsche and Marx's intellectual turning point introduced irrational as ration and ration as irration which, of course, this naming lacked any depth and it has been the construction of power relations and domination policy. In the first part, we were challenging theoretical basis of Iranian irrational wisdom; however, we will provide the background for voicing Kurdish rational unreasonableness. Kurdish tragedy in not shifting to the history of metaphysics or the unreasonable rationality have been condemned as irrational insurgents because Kurdish ration is a human kind and premetaphysical ration. Therefore, we have to return to pre-rationality and pre-metaphysics periods. i.e. to the Kurd itself. Returning to the Kurd itself is the return of the human intellect that has become notorious as irrationality in the dominant unreasonable metaphysical rhistory.

What we have mentioned in the previous material entitled as political intelligence was to investigate the history of Iran and the recognition of Iranian political rationale beyond the real political realms and widespread events of its history. Nevertheless, as the Kurd history has been the reversed history of Iran history, the theoretical framework examined in Kurdish history should be the reverse of the theoretical framework of Iran. Kurds have always defended their political freedom against the political domination of other sovereignties from Zahhak to Mazdak and Khoramdinan. The Kurds have never dropped the cotton in their ear to hear the song of the Sirens <sup>1</sup>. They were not only romantically looking for listening to Sirens, but they rebelled against someone who wanted to force cotton in their ears. Therefore, not political reason but self-sacrifice, or returning to itself, was the best way to spell out the logic of action, which, of course, entails the denial and critique of another political rationale on the logic of Kurdish historical action. In the first part, we present the theoretical desacrification basis of Iranian intellect and then we process the foundation of Kurdish history.

If we are to present a theoretical framework for examining the Kurd history, the mere use of the ideas of the western thought does lead to nowhere. Kurd history is contrary to the usual history. West thought explores the history of a nation through religion, culture and government. Western thought examines the history of a nation via investigating mythology, religion, culture and governments and the dynasty of empires. Nevertheless, Kurd history is a silent, accidental, dark, and non-transitional history to the pivotal period and philosophy of the spirit. History of Kurd is becoming existential and being real in the world, not thinking about the world. That is why Orientalists are all interested at the history of Iran as the count Kurds as a branch of Iran and historyless because the dominant in hit approach towards Kurds does not respond to presenting Kurdistan. History. I do not think a non-Kurd could achieve the discovery of Kurdish history. The non-written history of Kurd- as Spengler says on another occasion - are unwritten ideas that are going on in our veins. First, we have to live with it, feel it or believe it, then, bring it to the level of knowledge and concept. Although we still do not have the conceptual capability and scientific ability to provide the right theory for the reconstruction of the history of Kurd, we have to do our best in this regard.

In reviewing history and identity, it should be noted that, contrary to the common sense, it is the identity that makes the tradition, not the reverse. If we are lacking in tradition, this is because we are not only lacking in identity, but also we have not also been aware about our crisis and identity. Therefore, it is a modern identity that rebuilds and constantly interprets the traditions of the past. The Iranian intellectuals constructed the tradition of Islamic socialism with a tendency towards communism. Besides, with the trend towards nationalism, they constructed the 2500-year-old national tradition. Further, with the trend toward human rights and democracy, they constructed the millennial tradition of human rights and democracy of the old Iran. Therefore, if we are lacking in tradition, it is because we lack identity. Identity involves components and a definition, feeling being a Kurd does not necessarily mean Kurdish identity. Being Kurd is a meaningless name, and the belief in Kurdishism has not yet passed the level of knowledge and concept. Kurdish order is an exterior not an interior order. It is order in itself, not for itself; thus, it faces with theoretical poverty. Identity is formed in self-consciousness mode and as the internalization of a political order.

The identity (*hoviati*) in Arabic is derived from the infinitive “*ho*” meaning the being, the essence and nature of the individual or group. Identity addresses the questions that who we are that the others are not; in other words, it is what distinguishes our distinct features from others and what our own similarities with others are. Identity refers to our similarities and distinctions and to the understanding of a nation about its own who and what s/he is in the other. National identity is the reproduction and permanent reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories and traditions that make up the nation's distinctive heritage (Smith, 1994, in trans by Ansarian, 1383/2004: 30). Therefore, here we are trying to understand and reinterpret the pattern of exchange that has shaped Kurdish political movements. But it should be noted that the concept of identity is fluid and mentally-internal originating from the depth of history, and since our history is under the shadow of other histories, we must first consider “the return towards the Kurdish historical status” to dig out our history under the shadows and dusts of the history of others. Husserl’s theory on returning to oneself is a proper model for theorizing in this concern. Further, since we have not a written history and have not possessed our own history, we must recognize ourselves and our identity through interpreting the others’ views

about us and reknowing the "other" of the others. This will require some kind of intricacy because our history is an unwritten and hidden history that has been written and confiscated by others. We have historically lived in ourselves, not for ourselves. Our independent history has become a part of the others' history. Therefore, in the absence of our own historiography, we are not able to recognize our history except by knowing the other identities that our identity has become their identity. First, we must recognize our history and identity via the other's viewpoints, then we have to understand it give an interpretation out of the others' epistemologies. Then, we should reinterpret political materialism or political practices interpreted from other angles in the absence of our written history. Kurdish historical movements are practical and silent movements. Therefore, they are tragic and we must use tragic concepts to express them. We first have to eliminate the angle of others' analysis and interpretation that we have challenged the sacredness of other's understanding and analysis examining Iranian political wisdom. Now, we have to change the silent Kurdish political history in the form of language and concepts, that is, the concepts that come from the living experience of the Kurd itself. In other words, we have to return to the Kurd itself.

#### Husserlian phenomenology: Return to self

Phenomenology in origin means reading or recognizing the phenomenon. Husserl wants to put aside the phenomenology that impossible ontology limits it (Kant) and the ontology that dissipates phenomenology in itself (Hegel), and he focuses on his own phenomenology that poses the existence between the parentheses and examines the quality of the emergence of objects as an independent issue (Dartigues, 1972, in trans by Nevali, 1387/2008:6). Husserl believes that philosophical thinking takes reality itself as the source of his departure instead of dependence on philosophical traditions for the sake of creating an accurate philosophy and also the philosophical stimulus must be extracted from its own objects and problems (ibid., 16). Husserl's understanding and description of phenomena is based on the conscious and intentional experience that he considers the subject to be the provider of all the conditions for experience and understanding of the object (Ahmadi, 1381: 166). He considers the science and theories not to be able to discover the essence of the things; hence, in order to return to the things themselves, we must inevitably neglect the theories and sciences. Phenomenology has opened the domain of the pre-conceptual reception of phenomena (Chalmers, 1976, in trans by Zibakalam, 1387/2008: 137) which, by eliminating the concepts formed about one thing, we must go back to that thing, individual or object or culture and structure without historical assumptions. Husserl's phenomenology seeks to analyze the meaning of thing in the "living of the world" and not to focus on the objective nature of phenomena (Sherratt, 2005, in trans by Jalili, 1387/2008; 112). In fact, it negates all the concept and traditions formed regarding one thing and returns to that thing again with amazement and intentional understanding without any conceptual and traditional pre-suppositions and tries to speak it out without any precondition. Without considering the philosophical and historical tradition, it considers the thing itself (here it is Kurd) as the origin of the departure of philosophy and cognition. In this research, the very thing itself is the history of Kurd and the political and social practices and actions that has been defined under the guise of the concepts and structures of Iranian meanings. In fact, Iranians has moduled the load of their own meanings and concepts to "the thing itself, i.e. Kurd", and they have defined it in accordance with their own interests. In the first part of the theoretical



foundations, we criticized the Iranian political reason and its formatted concepts into the Kurd history using the method of discourse analysis revealing the relationship between the Iranian truth and its ethnic domi-nation and trying to desanctify those moduled concepts on Kurd history. In this section, us-ing the Husserlian phenomenological method in returning to the thing itself, we have turned our attention to the negation of Iranian moduled concepts and attempted to speak out the ex-perience of Kurdish living in the framework of concepts. It means that by rejecting the domi-nation of Iranian political rationality on Kurd history, we have introduced the living experi-ence of Kurd in the heart of history in the form of new concepts adapted to that living expe-rience of Kurd history. Of course, we do not intend to go back to its living experience. Con-cepts will be interpreted based on the very same living history of Kurd. It is only enough to remove the dust resulted from the domination of Iranian / Sami concepts on Kurd history, thus, the living experience of Kurd itself speaks out. It is only necessary to interpret it.

### Zizek's racism subject

In the eyes of Zizek, racism is presented in reply to this question: what do they want from us? He meant Jews in Europe that have no specific desires and needs, and they do not logically yield to the symbolic thing. From an anti-Semitic perspective, a Jew is a person who never knows what he really wants. Zizek acknowledges that this figure may be African-American or Japanese-but in Europe, the Jew is the subject of racism. A Jew is a suspect because we do not know what s/he wants. (Myers, 2003, in trans by Newrozi, 1375/1996: 145)

In Zizek's view, whenever a body enters the domain of the signification of a symbolic other or another has been castrated. The cost of obtaining a license in the general media of language is the lack of a self that is going to be completed physically. To enter the subject into the symbolic order, the real issue, i.e. its pleasure must be emptied. Symbolic issue has been formed based on the lack of itself as the racism subject is a representation of a thing itself or desire and instinct, it is faced with anger and hatred by the symbolic order is. Symbolic sym-bol can not fully answer pleasure (Myers, *ibid*: 147). Since Kurds has still remained loyal to the earth and instinct (dance of Mithrasi, Zahak Mardows, Mazdak, etc.) and they have not given up to the Iranian heavenly and religious culture of symbolic order, they are faced with anger and jealousy. The Iranian / Sami symbolic culture is formed on the basis of the lack of the principle of the thing and pleasure. In fact, Iran / Sami have left behind from the principle of pleasure and they are busy with its dreams- religion and philosophy – while Kurds have remained in the principle of “the thing” itself and desire and fervor. The Kurds have remained in the basics of the initial pleasure of "things" and they inevitably feel no need for the dream of the pleasure principle. In fact, the root of the violence and the metaphysical ethnic groups of history towards Kurds is the result of their chagrin of the principle of the first pleasure of the Mithrahi / Medians which they do not have it themselves and they have constructed their religious and spiritual philosophical restrictions in contrast to the principle of initial pleasure of Mihr/Kurd. An example of this is taking the Kurdish paradise from the earth to the sky. Para-dise was a Kurdish word in replacement with the garden, dance and drunkenness in this world. Metaphysical history beginning with Iran / Zoroastrian founded metaphysical ethics and religion opposing to the Median paradise of religion and, constructed the heavenly Fer-dos in opposition to Median paradise (see the text).

The Kurds hammered on the nail so tightly <sup>2</sup> that there are no doubts about plugging the nail to need to have a reflection on it. The wishes and desires of the Kurds have never been clear. Kurds seem to be a historyless and an unknown people. For this reason, the scholars have been astonished at all these rebellions and insurgents, and they have raised groundless reasons for them such as economic exclusion, the provocation of foreigners, the pressure of central-ized government, and so on. Unaware that these reasons are for other so-called Iranian na-tionalities, but why they do not rebel against the the government like Kurds? The unknown desires and needs of the Kurds have caused them to be removed even from the circle of man-kind and bring the lineage of the Kurds to the genius, the demon, and so on. Lacan says that for the sake of human being, one must subdue to the symbolic commandment; since the Kurds have not given up to the symbolic order, ththey have been knicknamed as Jinse and demons.

### Tragedy

The other concept on which the theoretical foundations for studying Kurdish history are based is the concept of tragedy. Tragedy is silent and not self-conscious. According to Rosenzweig, it is silent itself. Tragedy does not give way to the logic of history. Therefore, it is anti-historic, based on which I have put Kurd tragedy in conflict with Iranian history. In the words of Lukacs, the tragic hero is adapted to his nature and essence. His suffering is also due to this, and as Schelling says, we say something is permanent and kong-lasting we mean that its nature is not adapted to its nature and essence. The meaning of life is that nothing has ever survived to the end (Lukacs 1974, in trans by Rezaie, 13822003: 32). Lukács says that life can only be described in a negative way, that is, it is a thing that always overwhelms the flow of the life. To live, one must deny life( ibid: 33). The hero is a tragedy silent an d does not have pos-sibility to talk and communicate (Rosenzweig) because it considers itself as the same with his being, his action and his fate (Kaufman). A tragic hero is all action, it is silent because it is not selfconscious. Tragedy itself does not have the possibility to talk and communicate. There is still no other person to speak to this self from inside. If we look at the experience of Jews and Christians, we mran the same God by the other person because it is in the inner conversation with God that s/he finds concentratation or characterization. Therefore, tragedy leads to awakening of the spirit, but a tongue-tied self, a silent self and, as Rosenzweig points out, since this breath is silent and can not communicate, it can talk to itself. Ihus, it inevitably only needs to be displayed. That is why the Kurds are referred to as "irrational insurgents". Kurds are adapted to their own human nature and they did not give Wy to metaphysical history, which is why they are sefined as the practical and nullrational rioters of the history. History was not the principle but the result of an error. The history of error does not have the concep-tual features of the theory in accordance with practical and silent action of Kurd.

In tragedy, as Kaufman says, the distinction between external and internal world has not come to the level of consciousness, and it is only realized through the existence and action of the hero of the tragedy, not through inner life or dialogue (ibid: 243). The Kurds have never reached to the level of self-consciousness. They would never have had the ability of dialogue and conversation. They did not have others such as God to reach self-consciousness while conversing with him till they would own a philosophy and history. Kurd has a tragic nature of nature and shows its nature in action not in thought. Political movements are mani-festations of the being and nature of Kurd. Being of the Kurd has been silent. History emerged a time

when the faith in God came into being (Elijadeh). It is only through the dis-appearance of faith that the possibility of the emergence of tragedy is created. As Paul Ernest says, "Once we have been totally without God, we can reach a tragedy". While God itself was a riot against Kurdish identity; thus, how could Kurd dialogue with that God to awaken its spirit? If God is history itself, it is not possible for Kurd to talk to God / history because the emerging philosophy of God/history is the rebellion against the principle of primary pleasure / Mithra. For this reason, we spoke of the metaphysical culture and the mystical knowledge of Iranian Hermetic in contrast to the Kurdish prometheic / Dionysian spirit. The Kurds did not accept the metaphysical / divine wisdom to enter the process of history. Since they challenged the real, symbolic order of the metaphysical cultures of Iranian, Arab/Islamic and Greek, they were called as irrational Goths, Zahak, Gog, Magog and Jin by the gods. Kurd is the other of history. Kurd is the domain of thoughtless thinking of history and history emerged in opposition to Kurd.

Marr has said that Kurds are the forgotten nation of the history. I, the writer, say they are doomed to be forgotten in history. Perhaps Burkhart's theory that the history of a nation should be understood through its religion, state or culture, and its hegemony on historical methodology is an important obstacle to introduce the history of the Kurds. The hegemony of the spirit's philosophy which recognize the essence-being- only through concepts is an obstacle to understand the being of Kurd in history. Hegel says the essence of a nation shows itself in the history of that nation. Apparently, history is the same as the history of concepts and the manifestation of general reason, and since the Kurds do not have a metaphysical mentality and do not possess religious / mythological concepts, they are therefore devoid of history.

In contrast to Hegel, Heidegger sees the essence of a man as the existence of man or in his stature. Whatsoever makes a man a human is his resurrection, not his encounter in position of the subject, or a kind of self-existent essence (Heidegger, 1962, in trans by Jamadi, 1383/2004:13). Human is enclosed in subjectivity, is dependent on his nature and is lagging behind from it (ibid: 11). Heidegger knows this as transcendental, but the beginning of transcendence is not the approach to mysteries of paranormalism and richness, not the discovery of more realistic concepts, such as belief in the soul and ... not the extension of the absolute spirit in Hegel's philosophy, nor the manifestation of the Holy Spirit of the mystics (ibid: 71). The history of the Kurds is not in the the abstract mysteries and spiritual concepts but it is in coming into real existence and living and being in the world not in thinking on it. Therefore, instead of philosophical phenomenology of Hegel we must view Kurd history with the existential phenomenology of Heidegger which prefers human being, living and action to mentality.

## Prometheus

We defined the Iranian intellect with the aid of Hermes knowledge and the Kurds as a proletarian spirit, now we express our aim on Prometheus and Hermes. Prometheus is the symbol of rebellion and riot, and Hermes is the sign of flattery and submission.

Prometheus was cursed by the gods because it gave man the fire / wisdom and turned its back to the gods to save human beings. But in response to the prayers christening him to ask for Zeus' forgiveness, the rebellion Prometea replies: ... With all its obstinacy, Zeus is overthrown one day, Zeus on the ousting day, finds out that It's a long way from absolute power to the slavery... I am secure from death, what (Zeus) to be scared of and I have prepared myself for

everything "... speak the language of flattery in front of a ruler and praise him, but I take Zeus for nothing (Aeschylus, 1983, in trans by Maskob, 1350/1971: 54-55). Prometheus likens Hermes, the Messenger of Zeus, to a slave and accusing him of selfishness and suffering from the same selfishness, he responds to Prometheus "I cannot sell my misery to your position, know this well (Ibid: 57). Prometheus knows himself as "the enemy of all gods". Prometheus in answer to Hermes says that I never raise my hands like the women weeping to the door of Zeus (ibid: 60). Prometheus terms Prometheus, who is not afraid of Doom of Zeus, as tenacious, diverse thought, crazy and crass. Eventually, Zeus sends Eagles every day (the symbol of divine thoughts) to bring Prometheus live out alive. This is a short story of Prometheus which revolted due to helping man against the god and the gods led by Zeus made him suffer from persecution and endless torment. But Prometheus, instead of a pity and repentance to Zeus, defended his action with his stubbornness and obstinacy, and continued to his revolt against Zeus, and did not accept the stigma of surrender and obedience and repentance from Zeus. Prometheus prefers every day retribution to surrender to the gods, as the Kurds preferred depriving from history and liberating in the mountains to servitude and obedience to the goddesses. The only myth in the west, as Jalal Sattari says, that can be equaled to the rebellious Prometheus against the gods is the myth of Zahhak. Zahhak sold his soul to the devil in favor of man and earth and he rebelled against God. Zahhak, like Prometheus, along with Angerama Mino (Ahriman) and Akhun Dave, is trying to silence Farah Khodayan, but is faced with the resistance of the goddess Azar and Bahman and Sepand Mino. "the battle of the ether, or the fire and Azhi Dahak was over Farah Izadi that Azhi dahak wanted to extinguish the fire" (Amozgar, 1380: 49). The battle of Zahhak is with fire, Satan battle is with God and human contract is with divine hierarchy. In Avesta, Ayeh Dahak is considered as the enemy of the god of Azar or fire. The fire was the partner of a true order ... Arte or Ashe has either an ethical and cosmic value. A testament to the innocence ... ties him with justice (Guillmin, 1953, in trans by bagheri, 1378/1999:47-48). Fire or Farh Izadi is the symbol of the order of the political hierarchy and the lord / Slavery. Zahhak's battle over Farah Izadi is a battle for the restoration of its main meaning. Farah Izadi in Kurdish means very (many) gods. In Iran, its meaning has changed to glory or divine sign, which we will return to it in the next chapter. Here I will just like to show the contradiction of the two divine and terrestrial / human orders. For this reason, the author (Qaderi) has defined the Iranian political wisdom with the knowledge of Hermes, from Zarathushtra, Moghan to Tensar and Shahnameh, from Ibn Sina to Ghazali and Sahar Horde. Further, I have defined the spirit of the Kurds as Prometheus, from Mitra and Zahaq to Gomatha, Mazdak, Khorramdin, and contemporary parties, which is the same contradiction of metaphysical wisdom with human wisdom.

### Mithra: Contract / Paradise

Another concept for examining Kurdish rebellion is Mitra which means the social contract and paradise. Apparently, this concept came into being by thinkers like Hobbes, John Locke and Rousseau to deny the divine right of the kings and to give the metaphysical legitimacy of the sovereignty of the majority of the people in the early eighteenth century and it was thought that it did not have any precedent in the old world or it ultimately traced back to the Sophists or Stoics ... . However, this picture broke down with further investigations by Orientalists in ancient works and new researches in Mehr ritual. In the following chapters, we give a detailed

account of the Mithra religion. We here only refer to it in general. Mithra has meant the contract / paradise in the ideology of the Kurdish equality movements from the Medes to the Mazdakites and Khurdamīn contrary to Islam and Zoroastrianism religion which has given the legitimacy of ethnic domination-the Pars in the Abbasids and Sassanids. The Kurdish movements from the Mād - which formed the government with the theory of the contract - until the social uprising of Guamata, Mazdak and Kharadiman, have always been anti-classical, anti-Semitic and anti- metaphysical Iranian/Arab kings.

Another notion for understanding Kurdish identity is Mitra /paradise. The paradise was a Median word meaning full of pleasure and joy in this world that changed to heavenly ferdose in other cultures. The Madis paradise was a place of joy, dance and drunkenness, without any metaphysical and religious attachments, that we saw its political realization in Mazdak and Khoramdinan which the only limitation to pleasure was a mutual agreement and satisfaction, not metaphysical and religious restriction. The contract /paradise means the earthly being of Kurds and the denial of political and metaphysical guardians in defense of human intellect.

### Irrational insurgents

This feature is the same subject of the historical consciousness of Hegel, and the acts and beings of Haidgar. It is the same tragic silence that shows its nature not in dialogue but in action. Kurdish rebellions, apparently, as Lazarov <sup>3</sup> also pointed out, lacked any specific ideology, practical rebellions but without plan and self-consciousness. The Kurds have beaten everything like a blind camel. In fact, they did not give way to any general (whether metaphysical or political) sovereignty, and they did not have the proper culture and concepts to express their insurrection in words. This is true and it clarifies part of the proposition, but Kurd problem is other than this. The theory and ideology of Kurdish insurgencies are inherent in the nature of insurrections, and this silence, darkness, the lack of the theory, the contention and the incident of riots that is the origin of their ideology and culture, and the distinction of the Kurds derives from this point. If the Kurds ideologized and symbolized, then there would be no need to construct a theoretical framework other than a political ration to examine the history of the Kurds. This fact that we processed the Iranian / Sami history and ... the thought framework under the title of political wisdom, but we dealt with studying Kurd history in a more innovative and different framework, it is all rooted in the same difference between the Kurds and the rest of the nations.

Bandhesh wrote, unlike Hormozd who is wise and aware, the devil's actions (Mithra, Qaderi) are random and eventually unaware. Ahriman continues to have a false attitude about what has occurred to him for as long as he is not completely aware of his suffering and until he knows that his works is based on a false knowledge, his suffering comes from the omniscient and omnipotent creator (Zaehner, 1956, in trans by Badraie, 1377/1998: 65-66). Try to compare this with the intellectual domination of the Persians and Kurds' inappropriate leftist and Islamist theories in the contemporary movements that are practically involved with the struggle against Iran, but in theory, they are captured by the same Iranianism.

Shahrastani wrote: according to Mazdak, the actions of light are intentional, but the actions of darkness are incidental (Shahrastānī, cited in Klima, 1957, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 38). In interpretation of this statement of Mazdak, Klima wrote, the salvation day is the time of

the triumph of the de-graded masses and justice-seekers and that this emancipation is by accident. The term "kicking blindly" means blindly knocking out, blindly acting, like the maternal blind camel severely pounding the ground by your feet, it also means "invasion" and "uprising", "evil", "coercion" and the agreement (ibid: 39). A powerful maternal but blind camel, that is, the same thing that we call the irrational insurgents.

We will later refer to the Mithra rite and the meaning of the contract in it, which is the same as Mazdak agreement. According to Iranian religious contents, what is important is the devil's works that are coincidentally blind and incidental. Mazdak describes the acts of darkness according to the same principles of the devil. Apparently, as the Climma correctly points out, contrary to the misconceptions that Mazdak advocates light and the conscious acts of light, he advocates and protects the darkness. The Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions also refer to the Gothic as Gothian irrationals. We also refer to the Kurds as irrational rebels, who have practically fought and rebelled, but lacked the right theory and dialogue appropriate with their actions. We will explicate each of them (Mazdak, Mehr, etc.) in the related chapters; on-ly here we can point out that we cannot infer the theoretical framework of the west and the east thoughts for the purpose of examining the Kurd history. If we consider the being light through the philosophy of the spirit (wisdom, religion, etc.), Kurds have had a silent being. The ideas of the Kurds are in their blood, unwritten words that have not been written in any form ... The Kurds, like a blind camel crushed their feet on the ground with force. They have lived with no plans and ideas in history. Their actions have been blind, accidental, and silent, not according to any special plan and guidance of the shepherd (God, wisdom, religion, lead-er, etc.) and only based on agreement not any sort of hiearachy. Practical man who does not have a far-fetched perspective, will go on a journey without knowing where to dispart the goal that will eventually arrive at since if he knows where he gets, he stops going and trying (Spengler, 1933, in trans by Mohammad Bagher-e Hoshyar, 1377/1998: 12). Therefore, for the purpose of examining Kurd history, we must take into consideration the logic of of these practical, meaningless and discourseless insurgents, not awareness and enlightenment, because Kurdish struggles and insurrections lacked any notion of Kurdish order.

## Chapter 2

### From Gutians to Khoramdinians

### Introduction:

The purpose of writing this chapter is not to present a complete and detailed description of history, and the writer is not a historian. The only intention in writing the generalities of history is presenting a general outline of Kurdish history for its analysis in subsequent chapters. I focus on aspects of Kurdish history when important Kurdish riots signaled Kurds political action and their quest for identity. In this section, I will try to prove that movements such as the Medes, Goths, the Guamata uprising, the Mazdakites, the Kharaddinists were Kurdish, and Kurds were not the Aryan/Iranians. In fact, we attempt to write Kurdish political history not the detailed history of Kurdistan. The kind of political history, like a bridge, Iran's political intellect in order to ignore it has reproduced its components against it. This chapter is just to prove the existence of the Kurds in history, and in the following chapters we will analyze the Kurds' political actions, or indeed its existentialism, and the reaction of the Iranian political intellect against it.

### Difficulties of writing Kurd history

It is very difficult to write a generalization on the history of Kurd and its continuity after the Median period. Apart from the book of Badlisi, there is nothing but dispersed information in the works of historians from different countries and at different times in this domain. This information, albeit abundant, does not offer anything complete, and they can not succeed in compiling a coherent national history of a nation like Kurds who are highly divided among many tribes and clans with each of which having their own independent history (Badlisi, 1860, in edited by Zarnov, 1377/1998). The so-called modern Kurdish historians, without any philosophical understanding and without asking questions have merely repeated and recounted the views of others. For example, contemporary historians such as Safizadeh, Amin Zaki, after going through the description of the Medes, cut two thousand years and arrive at Salah al-Din and contemporary movements, that is, they have no understanding of the historical connection and its implications. These historians have either repeated the viewpoint of the others or they have recounted the events, which are worthless from the viewpoint of philosophical history and political thought is, while history, as Colingwood says, does not focus on events and incidents but on actions and thoughts. Kurdish history is the unwritten ideas that have not yet been written in the form of any words. We need to translate the unwritten ideas that flow in our blood and veins in the form of words, and we must turn our feelings and beliefs of being Kurd into epistime and knowledge. To do this, one has to question the history with a philosophical understanding and conceptualization abandoning the domination of the others and collecting countless historical information which is undoubtedly a difficult one. The difficulty is due to



several reasons; one is that the Kurds themselves do not have inscriptions and historical writings about their history. Another is that past and even new historians pay more attention to the meganarratives and write the history of empires and occupations. A nation like Kurd, that has had no empires and occupations during the history, has not been attractive to historians to write their history. In fact, the first reason - not having the writing and the inscription ... – derives from the latter one because Islamic period historians were mostly the historians of the courts and empires, and they have composed the history according to the wishes of the kings: Rashid al-Din "Jam' e al-Tawarikh", historian of the Safavid kings "Ahsan o tavarikh". These historians including Rashid al Din Fazlullah the historian of the Ilkhanites, Beyaghi the historian of Ghaznavids, Jovini the Mongolian historian, and ... have written down the history under the legitimization and exaggeration of their sovereign kings and in terms of their own religious / ethnic prejudices. In fact, historiography has been the monopoly of the kings. It is possible to risk posing this hypothesis that one of the reasons and origins of historiography has been the flattering kingship, and praising their occupations that the Kurds have lacked such a culture. The Kurds, who lacked the government and empire, did not need to write their own history, and because they lacked the Divani (the court) system, there were no devotees / historians around them to praise their conquest. Sources, inscriptions and works, if any, were lost by others due to the lack of their own political power. This fact that why they have not owned universal empires will be attended to in coming chapters (comparing the ideal model of the two Iranian and Kurdish governments in Chapter VII).

Klima, the great researcher of Mazdakian reported that there was nothing under the name of historical consciousness and historiography in ancient Iran, and the king has had a speaking monopoly about historical events. Why did not historiography exist in ancient Iran? Because the king by himself ordered all the people of the country like their father, and all the people were like their serfs and it was he who decided what should or should not be recorded for the future (Shahrastānī, cited in Klima, 1957, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 47).

Historiography was not so much important for the pre-Islamic Iran. "There is no real historical monument from pre-Islamic period. Bisotun inscription is a general report from the angle of view of a victorious ethnic group. The important events of the myths that were written at the time of the Sasanians under the title of "God letters have been eliminated as the actions of several characters ... for understanding the representatives of the dominant and ruling classes and they did not convey the realities even as much as a "German epic" carried (Spuler, 1952a, in trans by Falatori, 1377/1998: 9-10). It is natural that the Iranian kings also overstated the subjects that were to their benefits and they destroyed the history and identity of their opponents like the Kurds. It is possible to state the words of Klima and Spuler's, with a little difference, to the Islamic era; however, the analogy of these two eras is not just because many historians who have some-times been independent have been writing history in the Islamic period, but most of these historians have been able to write history in defending the ideology of the caliphate system and they were court historians of the kings. Therefore, they have not been able to write history out of the framework of rulers' ideology and they, similar to the kings of ancient Persia, have described the opponents of their sovereignty system with the help of the slander taken from the ideology of the ruling system. There is not much structural differences between this and the historical consciousness of the ancient period. Historians of the ancient Persians and Islamic historians also narrated only the story of the kings. It is because of this that they called the historical books dedicated solely to the history of the kings and

empires victories as "the godletter or shahnameh" (Kasravi, 1377/1998: 10). The word of God in the middle period of Islam was changed into "Shah" (king) whose application for non-God was considered as Shirk (herosity). Godletter turned into Shahnameh in order to avoid the delusion of the word of God in the meaning of the king (Bagheri, 1378:165). Sierra-Muslim is also the Arabic equivalent of Shahnameh (Katouzian, 1380/2001: 12)

One of the other reasons for Kurd removal from the rule of the truth of history science was the emergence of historiography especially the Greek historiography which was simultaneous with the political decline of the Medians / Kurds and the rise of the Persians in the arena of history. Therefore, Persian words and their political existence became permanent in the domination of truth on this land and marginalized Kurds lagged behind on the fringe of the history science, which I will deal with it elsewhere in detail.

Another issue in the study of history and the presentation of any image about the continuation of Kurd history is that they have not left behind any inscriptions or writings. Since the Kurds did not name and write about themselves, and they did not possess a government and an empire that could rule most Kurdish tribes, the names of the Kurdish tribes and clans were used other than the general name of Kurd. When Goities took power, Assyrians introduced the entire Zagros and Kurdistan region as Gaudi, Kassi, Huri, Mehrani, Mannayi and ... ; further, Kurdistan was known with the name of tribes such as Shadadi, Rawadi, Hasnavieh and Ayoubi during the Islamic period. During the Safavid and Ottoman times, Kurds were recognized with the name of the families of Ardalan, Baban, Bedlis ... and in contemporary time were introduced as Barzani, Mukryan, Kermanaj and .... Since none of the Kurdish tribes has ever been able to form a united and mighty empire through domination or agreement with other tribes, the name of one of the tribes has been recorded in history instead of a common name containing all the Kurdish tribes. Thus, we do not have a general word that indicates the permanent history and existence of Kurds.

Sumerians called Kurd as Kuti, Jut, and Judi ... The Elamites named them as Kurtesh which they used it in address to Azadgan. Asshur and Arami termed them as Kouti, Kurti, Carti, Cardo, Carda, Cardan and Karadak. Fars people addressed them as Kortesh (in Pars it was a name for the slaves), Curtin and Syrti ... Greece and Rome identified them as Cardosu, Cardoxi, Cardok, Cadukai, Cordoin and Med. Armenians recognized them as Cordoine, Curjix, Kortix ... Arab named them as Kurdi, Kardavi, Bakarda, Karda, Kardukhi, Kurtoxi, "(Khalil, 2011, in trans into Kurdish by Reza: 34). The drayors called them as "Katawiyeh,

Jordi, Joody, Gwadri, Karadak, Siratti, Ghorondai, Kada, Karaday, Kordeaia ... all are the same in spite of the lack of their resemblance, and Xenophon's Kardoxi and Sumer's Kardai are the names of the same tribe (Zeki, 1931, in trans into Persian by Tabani, 1377/1998). He knows all of them as referring to Kurd people (ibid, 70). Engnand considered the various names of Mad, Gutu, Oman Manda, Manna, Huri, Mehri (Mithra), Mars, etc. as addressing to a particular people, that is, the same Median (Onegenand, cited in Aliev, 1960, I trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009).

Before naming the land of Kurds as Kurdistan during the reign of Sultan Sanjar Seljuk, it was called Mad in the ancient times, and before that, as Gutu, Manai and Huri .... With the conquest of the Med by Pars, the word Kurd / Kurt meaning the slave substituted it. At the time of the Sasanians, they were called as Mei and then as Mah (Elima, 1379/2000: 27). Along with the

conquests of Islam, the land of Mad was called Mahin or Jabal. The parts of the Med that were occupied by the Kufa people were called "Mah al-Mokaf", and the parts that were captured by Basra people became known as the "Mah al-Basra" (Beladhuri, 9th century, in trans by Azarnosh, 1364/1985: 67). "Nahavand was the administrative center of "Mah al-Busra" and Dinawar was that of "Mah Al kofa" which was called Mahan (Markwart, 1901, in trans by Mirahmadi, 1373/1994: 48). Half of Mad or Mah was at the hands of Kofians and the other half was at the hands of Basrians, and the Caliphe ordered to call the Old Median as Mahin or Jabal, the upper part of which was the Mah al-Kofa and the lower part of that Mah al-Basra (Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 23). Mahan is from Helwan near Hamadan (Marquard, same, 45). Arab historians have always considered Esfahan as a part of Mede and Jibal (Markwart, *ibid*: 45). Thus, the land that later became known as Kurdistan in the Seljuk period was formerly known as "Jibal", "Mahin", "Mah al-Basra" and "Mah al-Kofa". Iraq-e Ajam was also a part of Madad state (Frye *ibid*: 22). The "Kurdistan" is the same that Arabs called it "Jibal" (Frye, *ibid*: 72). Arabs included Isfahan, Hamedan, Azarbayjan, Aran and ... in Jibal where its inhabitants were mostly Kurd (Barthold, cited in Frye, *ibid*: 72). In the time of Seljuk, the common name of Kurdistan was referred to the areas where the Kurds lived, which we will come to it later.

But this difference in naming does not mean an intrinsic and a real difference, this verbal difference due to the language distinction between the naming people is seen everywhere. Cteasias calls Astiag, the last king of Mede as "Stovi Gas." Nabonid, the king of Babylon, called him as "Ikh Tuviko", Iranian as "Azhidahak", Marapas the Armenian historians named him as Ashdahak, Grishman as Astyaghs, the Babylonian inscriptions termed him as Ishtovigo, Neiberg as Azhish dehako, and Arabs as Zahak. The Greeks called Kouros as Kors, the French as "Cirus", "Kirus", the English as "Cyrus" (Photius, 820-891, in trans by Khalili, 1379/2000: 20-22). The Egyptian people have called "Mitani" as "Nahari" and the Bible have named it as "Aram Naharam" (*ibid*: 72). The Greeks called the land between the Aras and the Kor as Albania, Armenians as "Aloghak", and the Irani, the Arabs, later as "Aran" it was termed as "Karabakh" in the period of Mongols (Minorsky, 1953, in trans by Khadem, 1387/2008: 16). The Greeks have named Zagros people as Kuti, the Latin writers as Kasi and in the Cuneiform graphs as "Kaso" (Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 84). Therefore, others have apparently named us/Kurds. Apart from the period of independent and unified Median sovereignty in which the word "Med" meaning Mid was derived from their ritual, Mitra, and it was their own lexicon also recognized by others, the Kurds have always been named by others. Even the word of today's Kurd is taken from Kurt and Kurtesh, which means slave. So, in order to write the history of Kurd, it was necessary to take a counter-common approach. Kurdish history cannot be extracted from one or more sources. History is not a macro-narration. Instead, we had to research paleontology, in fact, the archaeology of Kurd history, and via removing the foli-age and soils on it (other history), discover Kurd history from the footnotes of other sources and random sentences of historians to achieve the general concept of Kurd. To do this, you need to ignore relying on obvious evidences and to deconstruct the others' texts.

Medes: Natives or Aryans?

There are different opinions about the relation of the Medes with the tribes living on the Mede soil-Guthi and Caspi - and ... whether they are natives or Aryans; some of the researchers<sup>1</sup> have known Medes as Aryan who migrated to the Zagros and current Kurdistan in the first millennium BC. These scholars identify Medes not as natives, but immigrants. As a result, Medes have nothing to do with the tribes living in these areas, such as Guthis, Hurrians, Caspians, Mannaians, and others. These scholars do not deny the existence of indigenous peoples in the Mede union, but they consider all the Mede civilization, the formation of their state and the conquest of Ashur as due to the domination of the Aryan aristocracy on the natives<sup>2</sup>. Thus, they deny any racial / linguistic connection between the Medes and the tribes residing there earlier, that is, Guti, Huri and .... Some other scholars<sup>3</sup> accept dominating Aryan language on the Mede union from the 7th century AD. But they do not take this language domination as the population influence of the new immigrants on the indigenous peoples<sup>4</sup>, and they consider Medes, both politically and racially / linguistically, as the outcome of the indigenous peoples of Guati, Lolubi, Caspi, Mannaya, Mitani, Mehrani ... . Therefore, they know Medes as having the same race and culture of other native people in Zagros.

The Proponents of the Aryanism of the Medes first believed that the Aryans migrated to the Iranian plateau from the first millennium BC. The Assyrian inscriptions refer to Amada and Parsova for the first time in the scroll of Shlormansar I in 846 AD. Therefore, the fans of Aryan school posed that the Aryans migrated to Iran in the first millennium BC. The formation of the first empire in Iran by the Medes and then by the Persians was the result of the advent of the superior Aryan race in the region and the domination of Aryan aristocracy on the natives of the region. Later, it was proved via the new archaeological discoveries that there were similarities between Medes and the earlier tribes of Mannaya, Mantiani, Goths, and Cassi ethnically and racially. The researchers that recognized every civilization as the result of the dominance of the Aryan nobility on other races and they considered the natives as incapable of forming a government and civilization later reformed their theory. Therefore, they regarded the migration of the Aryans as two groups, some of which immigrated to the Iranian plateau and the Zagros earlier at 3,000 years BC.

For example, the supporters of the Aryan school, which had previously defended the Aryans (Mede and Pers) migration in the first millennium of BC, they reconsidered their position after the discovery of several Aryan terms among the names of the Horyan kings - from the third millennium BC and they recognized the Horyans as Aryan migrants. After it turned out that the Horyans were mentioned in the Akadian cuneiform tablets, Horyans were considered with regard to all the people of northwestern Iran "(Kurdistan, Qaderi) in the general sense. The Horyans were first seen in the east mountains and later in northern Mesopotamia and Syria, and even in Anatolia ... which they spoke various languages (Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 78). Thus, immigration hypothesis was questioned in the first millennium and they hypothesized that the Hurrian were the native masses of the same regions, and only the aristocracy and their rulers, the Mitani migrants, were Aryans. Then, in the tablets of Boghazkoy, a contract was found between the rulers of Mitani and Hittite which has mentioned the so-called Aryan gods (Mitra, etc.). Especially that these tablets belonged to 1,400 years BC. (Thieme, 1960: 301). They proposed a new hypothesis other than the major Aryan mass migration in the first millennium BC and that Aryans migrated to the Zagros areas several thousand years before. But if Indian Hindi marched to the west, how would they have gotten to the West of Iran and Zagros without leaving a trace in Iran and where are their works? (Frye,

1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 82) <sup>5</sup>. As Richard Frey pointed out, all of our awareness of Indian immigration is speculation. Grishman reconstructed Hindian movement and migration based on ancient works, gray and black clay containers, the statue of women, and the horseback rings and the golden and silver hornets in Gorgan to Turkmenistan- which they have come to Mythani – and this has caused Indians to come to the eastern corner of the Caspian Sea in the 4th millennium BC. Such works have also been found in Urumia and Mesopotamia and ... Therefore, Gireshman's reasons are unacceptable, and we cannot speak about their Iranian and Indian origins. Thus, according to new research on the relationship between the Medes and Gotis and Mannais<sup>6</sup>, and the unfounded hypothesis of Aryans immigration three thousand years BC, now the hypothesis of the Medes<sup>7</sup> being the native people of the region seems to be convincing.

Most of the writers who support the Medes being native of the region are Iranian history scholars and they have viewed the history of the Zagros and Medes as a branch of Iranian history<sup>8</sup>, and they have never independently studied the Median and Zagros tribes comprehensively. Regarding the history of the Medians and the tribes that made up the Median Union, only two writers have studied them independently and in detail. They both identified the Medes' union as the outcome of the Zagros tribes, namely, Guthis, Casaians, Lolubians and Mannayas and they considered Mede not as Aryan migrants, but as native people of Zagros and Kurdistan, which they have been the continuation of the same natives. This is merely the Aryan language that gradually has emerged from the eastern part of Medes and became the dominant Medan language from 800 BC. In the following, we will come briefly and with a little change to Diakonoff's views that have more scientific value, then Aliev and Marr.

Herodotus mentioned the six tribes in the Median union: Those six tribes lived in the triangularshaped place between Hegmataneh, Rey and Isfahan (Aspadana) (Gershevitch, 1985: 75). Mogh tribes settled in Ray (Rhaga) and modern Tehran, apparently to meet the spiritual needs of the Medians (Zumerchik and Danver, 2010: 33). Partaceni tribe lived inside and around Aspadana. Arizanti tribe were located near and inside Kashan and Busae tribe stayed near or surrounding the capital of the future Mad, Hegmataneh. Budii and Struchates lived in the villages of Mede center (Thomson, 1948: 43).

According to Diakonoff, among the six tribes that Herodotus mentioned: "Busians", "Paratachenians", "Strokhatians", "Ksitsyan", "Buddhians", "Azrizantian", and "Moghs" only Paratachenian tribe in Esfahan region has an Iranian roots and "Erizantian" has an obvious derivation of Iranian root. Arizantians were known as Aryan tribes among other tribes; thus, other Median tribes could not have Aryan origin, that is, they were not Iranians. The main masses of the Medes were formed from Gothian and Elamite tribesmen and Casipians who acquired the language of the Indian newcomers, not that the inhabitants of that district were totally replaced. The inhabitants of the Medians were the same inhabitants of Guti and Caspian and ... only their language became Aryan. This fact that there has not been found an Indo-European root for the names of the tribes of Busian, Moghan, and Budians <sup>9</sup> up to now and also this point that we can hardly find an Iranian root for more than half of the particular names of the Medes originating from the ninth and eighth century both will confirm the above statements. Moghs and Arizantian lived in the east of Mad near Ragah, the present Tehran, Busayan in Hamedan and the Budyans were the westernmost tribe of Med. Bodiyan and Bussyian which were among the main tribes forming the Mad Union, have not accepted any

effects of Aryans, and there is no evidence that they are Aryan's. There are some effects of Aryan language on Mogs and Arizantianins were at the easternmost point of the medians and they were under the influenced the newcomer Aryans from the East.

Median names having Iranian roots are found in the seventh century BC and the Aryan language was the common language of the Median tribal union. But the main ethnic composition of Median people were Kuttis, Lolubians, Mehranis, Horions and Casis, not Aryans. Some of the terms and names of the people may have changed, but there is no reason for the massive transfers of people from one point to another. Therefore, the ethnic composition of the people of that land (Mede) has been unchanged since the third millennium to the beginning of the first thousandth.

We cannot find a clear origin for the word "Mad" in Iranian language; though, it is Medai and Amadi in Assyrian, Mdi in Greek, Mar in Armenian, and Matt in Parthian. Median tribes unions existed as a non-Iranian tribal alliance and its Iranian part only later joined it. The Iranian part of The land of the Med inhabitants was formed only later in the form of a separate Aryan tribe ... The term Medes may have the Elamite-Cassipi root; however, the term Medes has long been common in this land. Mannies, which formed the core of the Median kingdom, were the manifestation of the Gothic-Lolubi government. Gothic language was an independ-ent language from the same root with Huri and not an Aryan language. Goti's term was a gen-eral term used to refer to various tribes living in the north and east of Babylon, and they called all the people of Manna and Mad as Guati (Diakonoff, 1985, in trns by Keshavarz, 1379/2000: 100-145s).

Guthi's term was a general term used for all the tribes of Zagros and Kurdistan ... Babylonians and Assyrians sometimes referred to the Medes and Mannesis as Gutis (Diakonoff, cited in Ziapour, 1355/1976: 384-385). Diakonov correctly pointed out that the Madi Union was an non-Iranian(Aryan) tribal union, and the Iranian section of its inhabitants later joined it. This word of Diakonov is true, but there is no document available about the presence of the Iranians in the Median Un-ion except Herodat's writing. Herodotus wrote the book in the 4th century AD when Iranians dominated Medians, i.e. he has written down the names of the Median tribes in the period of Iranianization and influence of the Iranians in Med. This means that later tribes from the Ira-nian aristocracy have infiltrated Mad soil along with the capture of the Mad land the same as the time when some Arab tribes emigrated to Mad after its capture. Therefore, the mention of the Iranian tribes in the Median Union in Herodotus has not been a valid reason for their pres-ence in the Median Union in the 7th century AD. Herodotus has brought the names of some Persian tribes for the formation of the Persian Achaemenid empire, which did not existed be-fore, and were probably natives or Scaians, and subsequently went under the domination of the Persians in political terms or declarations of subordination. (Zarrinkob, 1368/1989: 85). Hertsfield and Hintz correctly identified Medians as Sagratians who led the Mads in the uprising against Darius and they considered them to be the ancestors of today's Kurds (Herzfeld, 1967), cited in Nikitin.1956, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 49; Hinz, 1987, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 55). Even the root of the Zagros word is derived from the name Zagarti / Sagarti, which has been converted to Zagros. Sagartia and their military elites may have given way obedience to Persians after some failure from Darius or it is possible that part of them have been forced to migrate to Pars regions; thus, Herodit has brought them under the name of Persians (Azkaii,1368/1989: 45). Therefore, Herodite has brought Sagartia in line

with the Persian tribes. However, they were not Persianmes, but they were Medians. Herodite has mentioned Arizinntans and Mogs as part of median tribes, but they were Persians. Herodites did not name the Mede tribes whose political weight were decreased during the domination of Iranians on Medes – i.e. during Herodites' life time – or when they were marginalized because of the Iranians ruling like Maran, Mehriyan, Kurti, Kurdokhi and ... . Diakonov also pointed out that Matinans, Kadosians, Manaian, and Lolubians called themselves as Median a century and a half after Persian ruling over the Medes (ibid: 416) which their names were not stated as part of the Mede union in Herodotus' book. Therefore, Herodite's book is not a good source for accepting the existence of Iranian / Aryan in the Mede union.

“Aliev” also has ideas similar to Diakonov about the unification of the Medes and the indigenous tribes of Zagros, such as the Gotis and ... and the Medes being native of the region. In his opinion, there was no centralized mass of Iranian-speaking ethnicities in the western and northwestern regions of the future land not in the nineteenth nor in the eighth centuries, and Iranian-Aryan elements gradually penetrated into the Mad land in the late eighth and early seventh century (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 21). All the nomologic sources belonging to the early period considered the formation of the ethnic union of Mada, Matheti and... as completely non-Iranian speaking but as Caspian speaking people (ibid: 122 and 129). He identified Arizanti-an as an alien and foreign element in the Mad Union because in the Sargon script there also came the "Arribe" (Aryan) independently and with no relation to the Medes. Later, they joined it as an alien ethnic group distinctive from all other Med tribes under the name the Aryan people (ibid: 129). He considers the Medes and Manna as the direct heir of the unity of the Gutic-loluboic tribes, and he recognizes Mars, Ummanda, Gutti, Caspi, Mannaya, Mehri-yan and Hurian as the tribes forming the future Mad (ibid: 115 and 291). He was also against the artificial separation of the Medes from cassips and native Guti tribes (ibid, 122). He regards the idea of presenting Mads as being Iranian as a harmful and superficial bias which was built based on metaphysical dead views. (ibid, 120).

Nikolai Marr (1864-1934), the originator of the Japhetic theory on the origin of language, considers Zagros ethnic groups to be neither Semitic nor Indo-European, but Japhetic. He regarded his most important contribution as the struggle against the theory of migration. He defended the Medes to be as the indigenous people and not to be Iranians (Marr, cited in Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 119). He identifies Meds as the racial outcome of Gothic, Kashi, Subaru, Mitani and Huri tribes which have a much older history than Aryan immigration. From his point of view, Median language has made a fundamental change and it has changed from the Yafesi language into Arians. But this change of language does not mean the change of the inhabitants and the race, and the Medes are natives, not Aryans (Marr, cited in Nikitin, 1956, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 51-55). Of course, Je Mar word saying that Median language has changed and Aryan language has been moduled on them, is not correct because, as Will Durant noted, the Per-sians borrowed their language and writing from the Medes

#### From Guti to Med

Due to the lack of a Kurdish emperor, there are plenty of names such as Guti, Madi, Mehri, Ummanda, and ... addressing to Kurds; thus, others have moduled one of the leading tribes in

addressing to the Zagros residents. In the history of Akkad, Oman Manda has been mentioned addressing to the Medes but in Nabvayd's letter to Med's army (in Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 392). He mentions Hokheshtera, the Mad's king, in line 24 of Gad history, but in line 38 he commemorates Oman Munv da kings. Diakonoff considers both terms as the same, and he recognizes Manda to be a Median government (Aliev, *ibid*: 401). Oman Manda is also used to refer to Astyagh, the Medes and Gutis in the interpretation of Nabonid (Gershevitch, I (editor), 1985, in trans by Qaderi, 1387/2008: 655). Complete review of this term – Oman Manda – convinced KamTerosi that they are the same Medes (Oyaji, 1381/2002: 49)<sup>10</sup>. Stricks knows Medes, Umannids, and Matis as the same. Ismichk and Prasek also identifies OmanManda, Mad, Mitani, and Manayyah as identical (Nikitin, 1956, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 46). Similarly, Onegnand realizes the names of OmanManda, Mad, Manai, Mitany, Huri and Gutu in reference to a particular people, i.e. the Medes (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 100). Also according to the Assyrian inscriptions, the Mannais were closely related to the Medes (Pirnia, 1362/1983). The images depicted in the Assyrian inscriptions of Mannayas shows pictors and images the same as those drawn from the Medes that this indicates their ethnic / cultural identity (Khonji, Ali. (1358/1979:162).

As the result of the excavations obtained from Babylon - 23 AH. M - The names of Gutu and Manmand are mentioned together (Clark, and Willermet, 1997, in trans by Biglari, 1375/199: 33). The spizer writes in the history of the Near East when Sargon II pushes out Gutis from Babylon in the 28th century BC., he sought after them up to Madayan state (Tabani,1380/2001: 91). Therefore, as Diaconov also pointed out, the term "Ma:d" was common before the arrival of the Aryans. Sargen in the 28th century BC. M has used the term Mede, that is, Median the same native Guttian, whose presence record dates back to 3,000 years BC. Ashtiani also writes that the Medes were known at the time of Babuli's Hammurabi (Ashtiani, cited in the Tabani, 1380/2001: 94). Thus, the presence of the Medes in Zagros traces back to 23 centuries BC. That have been relatives and from the same race as Gutias, Hurrian. Manays, Mehrans, Mars, and ... . No longer the hypothesis of Median migration and being Aryan in the first millennium BC seems to be defensible.

Some researchers<sup>11</sup> have pointed out that the name Med is rooted in the word Mehr-Mitra. Med means middle which implicates either mitani or central. Armenian historians<sup>12</sup> refer to the Medes as Mars. The ethnic group of the Mar, which the ancient writers have mentioned<sup>13</sup>, lived in the area between Lake Van and Urimia. In the same district there lived Mehri and Mehran tribes in Assyrian resources in the 13th Century AC. There has also been talked about Mehri state in the contract of Hitti kings in the 13th century BC. It has been pointed out In the Assyrian resources of the 7th Century BC that the inhabitants of the Western Media were speaking in Mehrani language. The word "Mhr" is the shorter form of the very old term of the Mehr (Aliev, *ibid*: 100-101). The deletion of h is a general phenomenon in Asian languages that makes the Mahar word turn into Mar (Aliev, *ibid*: 161). Esrahedun spoke about the people of Mehr Mehrani in Zagros (*ibid*). Theophilacus considered Mehr and Mehran as one of the famous Families of the Median, which later became known as an Iranian tribe. Mehr tribes are placed on the list of non-Iranian peoples, Horiens, and Mehranini belongs to the Horyan/Subari (*ibid*: 101). So, Mar and Mad has been derived from Mehr and they were all Mehr (Mithra)-preachers<sup>14</sup>. Mehr or Mithra was their religion and the names of Manda and Mad and Mar were taken from it. Mar, Medes, Mehr, Mantani, Ummanmanda, Manneas, the Horis, and the Gutis, were all tribes of the same ethnicity/nation. No inscriptions of the Medes have been found;



thus, whenever one of the chiefs of the tribes were in charge, the neighbors have mentioned the name of that tribe for all Medians. Therefore, there was no general name covering all the Median tribes, because they had no empire and the general government under one umbrella term. It is only in the 7th century AD after the formation of the mother Empire, the common name of Mad is used for all the tribes of Zagros and Kurdistan.

### From Median to Kurdish

The researchers know Medes as relatives and coracial of Gutis and the rest of the tribes living in Zagros. But what is the relationship of Kurds with the Medes? And to which racial and ethnic group Kurds belongs? There are different theories about the origin of thea Kurdish race, some consider them s from the Jin (goblin) race <sup>15</sup>, others know them as Aryans<sup>16</sup>, and a group identify Kurds as the native of the <sup>17</sup> Zagros and Kurdistan regions. We will return later to the genius-based theory of Kurds. But among the new scientific theories about the Kurds, there are two Aryan and native schools that were presented respectively by the two famous theorists of Kurdish history. Minorski is a Proponent of the Meds being Aryan School and Ja.Mar is the proponents of the school of the Medes being aboriginal of the region. Hoerver, both have something in common that they consider Kurds as the descendants of the Medes. (Nikitin, 1956, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 55). As the prominent scholars studying Kurds (Diakonoff, Aliev, and Marr. Snake) consider the Medes as descendants of the Gotic, two Kurdish wellknown scholars (Minorsky and Marr) also consider the Kurds as the descendants of the Medes. We first articulate the para-doxes of the Aryan School, and then we will look at the viewpoint of some supporters of Kurds being indigenous people of the region - which seems to be more accurate.

Proponents of Kurds being Aryans first believed that the Aryan Kurds migrated to Iran plateau from the first millennium BC. The Assyrian inscriptions mentioned the names of Amada and Parsova for the first time in the inscription of Shalma Nasr the First in 846 BC. One of the most well-known Orientalist who introduced the theory of Kurdish emigration and then stuck in conflict with his contradiction, was Western Minorsky, a Russian origionally. At the twentieth Orientalist Congress in Brussels in 1938, Minorski correctly put forward the theory of the Median origins of the Kurds (Minorsky, 1949, 143-152).

He considered the Kurdish language and Median language as derived from the same root. He also identified Kurdish race as a combination of the ancient clans of the Merdowis and Kurdowis, the Kurtiowis, - who spoke in the accent close to Median language (Tabani, 1380). He regarded the Kuretois, the Kordechî, and the Mards as the Median tribes (Minorsky cited in Nikitin, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 48).

Minorsky writes: Kurdish is an Iranian language, but it is somewhat separate from Persian ... Kurds in ancient times had a strong language that all of today's dialects were derived from it ... Kurdish language is rooted in the language of the Medes, and Mad tribes must be identi-fied as Kurd. "(Minorski, cited in Sultani 1382/2003: 25-24). Expansions of Kurds have only been made through the small Mad or Atropatne, i.e. the present-day Azarbaijan "(Minursky, cited in Nikitin, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 44). He also considered Kurmanj as comprised from two parts,Kurd and Man Or Manias and the Medis "(ibid., P. 50)

This part of Minorsky's statement is acceptable and logical; therefore, we, Kurds, must thank him for presenting the theory of the Median root of Kurds. After the recent archeological discoveries<sup>18</sup> indicating the existence of Kurd's name up to two thousand years ago, Minorsky presented this inconvincing theory, "Kurds have moved from the east of Iran to the West - today's Kurdistan. This does not prevent the matter that some people or tribes have lived with a name similar to Cardo in central Kurdistan which had been mixed with immigrants "(Minorsky, cited in Zeki, 1931, in trans by Tabani, 1377/1998: 44). As Amin Zeki has correctly pointed out that it's unlikely that there would be two peoples with the same name, but with a separate race in two parts of the world "( Zeki, ibid: 66). Other than Minorisky, other writers<sup>19</sup> also make a distinction between Kurd which may not be true. As Minorsky himself later admitted, "the land of the old Cardoshiwi, today is the main center of the Kurd people ... Kurdshu and Kurd are the same names and two people of Kurd and Khaledi are equal (Minorsky, cited in Zeki, 1931, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 47). Thus, the theory of Kurds migration in the first millennium BC is very weak, and the theory of Sipaizer and ... which believe that the Kurds ancestors were the main and old residents of Zagros and Kurdistan is more logical (Zeki, ibid: 75) Many other Iranian and foreign scholars also accepted the Median roots of Kurds<sup>20</sup>.

#### From Guti, Kardokhi to Kurdish

Most of the researchers<sup>21</sup> have confirmed the sameness of Kurd, Kurti, and Kardo. Draiwier correctly identifies Kurti, Kardai, Kardoxi, Kurtoxi, Kardak, Kurdoen and ...as the same despite their dissimilarities and he considers Xenphon Kardoxoi and Summer Kardai as the name of the same clan indicating Kurd ethnic group (Zeki, ibid: 64). There has been named a place called Kurxich in Armanin geography. Adonts, the writer of the book "Armania", believes that Kurxich is originated from Kurtich that means Kurd. Fostos, the orientalist, considers Kurdox, Kurdix, Tamorix as the land of Kurdoen. Hobshman, who has tried a lot to find out the differences between Kurdrix and Kurtiyoi, identifies their distinction due to the verbal difference that Noldeke and Hartman have also accepted it "(Minorsky, cited in Zeki, ibid: 48-49). Two inscriptions from the time of Tukulti – Ninurta, the Ashur ruler, calls Guti in one of the inscriptions as Gotti and in the other one as Kurti. It means both are one, and it has been addressed to the same ethnithity (Zeki, ibid: 64).

Sir Sydney Smith <sup>22</sup> writes: Kurdistan is located "in the north to Lake Wan, in the east to Khapur in the east of Kirkuk and in the south to Babylonia. Kurds language is neither Sami nor Aryan or Sumerian, but Shubari from the Caucasian branch ... . In 2300 AD. "Forces of the" Our "government were sent to suppress the small ethnic Kurd minorities ... Lolubi Sey-mour, Erbil, and Halvan, ... which they were a single nation, but without unity...an indige-nous people named Uman Manda Which later merged with Mad and Sit, settled in the East of the Black Sea ... and formed a Mitani government ... from 19th Century. M - ... to 16 CG. M, Mitanis dominated all over Kurdistan ... then at the time of Xenophon and .... It was spo-ken a lot of Kurd ethnic group (Kurdoki- Qaderi) ... The distance between Xenophon and Assyrian texts is two hundred years old, but the Achaemenid inscriptions of that time in no way have spoken of Kurdistan. Kardoxoi is the same Kurdish people who had tendency to-wards independent because they had an independent language ... Kurdish language is not de-rived from Persian, it

is older than it is "(Smith, cited in Zeki, *ibid*: 59-54). Although the contents of this article are somewhat vague, but it is clear that Smith is also one of those researchers that have accepted the sameness kurd and Kardukho and words used to refer to Kurd Babylonians inscription in 2300 BC. M. Thus, "Kurdkey" in Sumerian tablets, Kurdkhoy in Xenophon and Amada in Assyrian inscriptions are all referring to the Kurds (Zarrinkob, 1384/ 2005: 333).

Kurdxoi, which Xenophon referred to in his book <sup>23</sup>, is the same as Kurds. The word in the Armenian language is a sign of plural (Minorsky, cited in Safi Zadeh, 1385/2006: 64). Minorsky described the land that Xenophon spoke of as the Kurds cradle (Minorski, cited in Tabani, 1385/2006: 54). Following Xenophon, some called the left bank of the Tigris and Mount Jody and Ararat less as Karudkhoy, but rather more as Kordovians. In the first century AD, Straubun considers the Tigris coastal part as belonging to this tribe (Straubon, cited in Safizade, 1385/2006: 65). Drivers knows changes in this name due to the difficulty of pronouncing "K" in the Sami ... this region is Kardu in Arami language, and the island of Ibn Umar as Ghazarratti, Kardu and .... in Armenians it is Kurdokh and the Arabs called it as Bakarda and Kardai ... Yaghot Hamawi considers Bakuda as part of the island of Ibn Umar ... Kardah later became Bohtan <sup>24</sup> and the island of Ibn Umar "(Zeki, *ibid*: 45) Migjarson knows Kurdoens as the ancestors of today Kurd and the children of famous Medes. He also knows the land of Nairi, which Sennakherib (682 - 705) fought against them in accordance with his inscription on Mount Jody as the same area that changed to Kordoen (Zeki, *ibid*: 92). Kurdoen was renamed as the island of Ibn Umar and Bhutan at the time of Islam (Khalil, 2011, in trans into Kurdish by Ali: 33). The place where, according to the Minorosky, the has always been the cradle of Kurds (Minorsky, cited in the Tabani 138/2001: 54).

In the book "the tribes of Mezopotamia, Spaiser mentions the Kurds as the descendants of the Medians, Gotis race and Hurris in Zagros mountains (Nikitin, 1956, in trans by Qazi, 1377/1998: 42). He traced the history of the Kurds to 6,000 years earlier, believing that there is no history of a nation older than the Kurds in Zagros and the current Kurdistan<sup>25</sup>. Henry Felinenz believes that the Kurds were the first men to come to the northwest of Iran during the ancient rocky period, settled in Sulaimaniyah and ... to Rawandez and ... (Nos. Semi, 1935 vol51, cited in Tabani, 1380/2001: 64). In Hamadan, a bronze head was found from the Guatean kings kept at the Bremer Mu-seum of the New York Gallery which according to Sir Kisson is very similar to the Zagros Kurds (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 11)

G Fiantists consided the name of Manda taken from the Kurdish people, and he knew Manda and Mani as the same as the name of Kurmanj, the majority of the Kurds (Aliyev, the same, 183). Minorsky, also identified the Kirmanj as plural of Man or Mani and the Medi (Nikitin, *ibid*: 50). Ryseke knows the term "Getty" and "Koutier" and "Kurti" and "Kurdish" as the same that are all known as Kurds (Safi Zade, 1385/2006: 65). Albert Oumsted also consid-ers the Kurds as from Mitani race (Olmstead, 1948, in trans by Moghadam, 1384/2005: 14)

Assyrian documents use the name of the Gotis Medis in the place of each other, he mentions the land of Mede as the land of Gutis... The first tribe named in the Median union were the same people of Gutu. In the Babylonian documents, it is said that the Gutis bend their knees to the Median kings. That is, the Gotis and the Medes had both the same language and race ... The mainland of the Gutis is today's Kurdistan, and Guthic and Median are the ancestors of today's Kurds. (Khonji, 1358/1979: 143 – 144)

Guaemata and Farawartish being Kurd:

In this section, we will prove Geumata uprising as Median. We will review the analysis and the manner of the uprising, the goals of the Guamata uprising, or religion, was it the response of Moghan, or against it, was it Zoroastrians or against them later<sup>26</sup>. Our hypothesis is that the Guamata uprising and its continuity in Farhurtish was the reaction of the Medes against the domination of the Persians, and the bursting the dissatisfaction from the loss of the Medi-an independence by Cyrus the Achaemenid. This uprising occurred on March 11, 522 AH. M (Ivanov, cited in Arvidovich, 1977, in trans by Keshavarzi, 1359/1980: 78) after the Cambujia campaign in Egypt and 28 years after the Medes, lead-ing by Astiag, were defeated by Cyrus. It is narrated that it lasted seven-months from around spring up to the end of the Meher.

There are various views and interpretations about the Guamata uprising; some scholars have questioned the Median aspect of the Geumata uprising<sup>27</sup>, but the majority of ancient and contemporary historians have confirmed the Median aspect of the Geomatian uprising<sup>28</sup>. The scholars who question the Median aspect of the Geumata uprising and regard Guamata - Samirdis, not as a Median person, but as the real brother of the Cambujia' brother provide the following arguments In the following, we look at these arguments critically and say that It does not mean, of course, that he is not Median. True Berdya also came from the second wife of Cyrus, Astiag's captured daughter that we will address in the following chapters. Here, we refer only to Median being of Guamata's uprising.

- 1- One of the reasons of scholars for the denial of Bardiya's slaying and also Guamata uprising being Median are the contradictions that exist in the sources about the time, place, and the way of Bardia's killing. "Information about the slaughter of the Bardia is contradictory. According to Herodotus, Bardia participated in Curacaei's deployment of troops to Egypt Cam-byses and then he was dipatched to Iran and killed. Bistoon inscription says Bardiya was killed before the start of the campaign against Egypt, and this issue was concealed from the people. Katziz writes that this murder took place before Cambyeses seized Egypt. "(Dandamayev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab 1373/1994: 171-170). The controversies of historians about the time and manner of Bardi-ya's murder are not a convincing argument in rejecting the reality of the event. Due to the lack of reliable documents and a clear chronology of events, and also the absence of a serious obstacle to the absolute authority of the Iranian kings, such contradictions in all Ancient his-torical affairs is natural. The calenders of Nabonid and Nicholas Damashchi have mentioned a great deal of wars for three years in the struggle between the Medes and the Persians, which led to the final defeat of the Medes. However, many others such as Herodotus have denieded this happening as if it has occured during one day and the Medians themselves have accepted the Persian domination without any serious war. Further, Herodotus regards Diako as the founder of the Median State in 715 AD, while Assyrian documents not only did not consider Diako as the founder of Medes' ruling but also they have written about their domination on the Median land and the Medes obedience to them. They also pictorised Diyaco, not as the founder of the Medians, but as one of the chiefs of Mannay – not as Medians but as a chefsman. The in-consistencies' reason in the time and place of Bardia was the result of murder in complete concealment. Due to the popularity of Bardia and his removal as a rival in his own way, Kambujia did not openly took responsibility for determining the time and placeof his murder.

Although according to Bihstun's writing (DB I, 30ff) and Photius, 820-891 BC), Ctesias of Cnidus: 10), the slaughter of Bardia was before the battle against Egypt, Herodotus cited it as simultaneously with Egypt battle (Her, III, 63). Troilus-Justin even regard it after the death of Cambyses (Chisholm, ed. 1911, (Troilus-Justin)). Nonetheless, all sources cast no doubt on the death of Bardia, even the reason beyond the killing of the younger sister of Bardia-Cambyses. She had gone to Egypt with him, and Cambyses had taken her as his wife was because of her protest to the murder of Bardia (Herodotus, 1987, in Trans by Mazandaran 1384/2005: 209) as she was Astiag's descendant.

- 2- The similarity reported in the classical sources between Magi and Cambyses's brother (Herodotus, *ibid*: 220) reflects the fact that there was no Magi Gomatae in the king's throne. Herodotus called Cyrus the son of Smerdis, and the Magi who seized the power as the son of Cy-rus was also called Smerdis (Olmsted, 1938: 396). These two were very similar, and distincting them from each other was not an easy task. Ctesias also says that this Magi was remarkably similar to Tania Exarata (Dandamavev, 1989: 88). In reaction, it must be said that it is true that Herodotus has mentioned the similarity of the appearance, but he has not written that they had the same name, but he says that the Magi's brother took his name just because he wanted to rule with Smerdis (Herodotus, 1987: 220). The similarity of Magi and Cyrus's son may well indicate that the authors have not been conceived other reasons for the long-term concealment of the murder (Wiesehofer, 1978, in trans by Sadeghi 1389/2010: 57). The story of Gaumata's similarity with Bardia is one of the poetic exaggerations of the ancient historians that have not been mentioned in the inscription of Bistun (Zarrinkob, 1368/1987: 142). Therefore, there is no documentary about the similarity of the appearance of the Magi/Gomata and Bardia, and the resources have made simplifications in this case (Dandamavev, *ibid*: 89).
- 3- It is not acceptable that the slaughter of Bardia should remain hidden to such an extent not only from the eyes of the empire, but also from the eyes of relatives, friends and servants of Bardia for five years. (Dandamavev, *ibid*: 89). In response, it should be said that the vast majority of those who knew Bardia, along with Cambyses, were in Egypt for three years old; thus they thought he was king's brother in the court (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 57). This point also suggests the fact that they did not believe Cambyses's confession to the murder of Bardia and believed that Bardia-Smerdis has personally revolted. Even "Prokizasp" had seriously denied that he has killed "Smerdis" because it was dangerous for him to confess that one of the Cyrus' sons was murdered in his hands after Cambyses's death (Herodotus, 2008 224). On the other hand, there may also be some among those aware of the murder that chose to be silent due to the fears and opportunism<sup>29</sup>. In addition, Herodotus declares that Magi never left the palace, and no one was allowed to appear before the Shah. Although "Fidome, the king's daughter was in the court, she had never seen Bardia. (Herodotus, 1387: 225)<sup>30</sup>.
- 4- In contrast to other false kings, Darius has focused on concealing Guemata's descent and lineage, and he would not show the victim's body to the public ("(Dandamavev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab 1373/1994: 179). According to Darius' inadequate reports, critics questioned the truth that the one whom Darius killed was really Guemata, but the opposite deduction is true, because if Darius wanted to conceal the slaughter of Bardia, he could have given more accurate data about him to overcome the doubts regarding of the

Magi's past. The conditions following Geumata's killing was different from the execution of other false kings, "killing the

Magi was a coup d'etat, and the Darius' next state of affairs was extremely dangerous. However, the execution of other insurgents was different: they were executed to give lessons to other possible insurgents seeking victory in the unrests and showing Guemata's corpse would provoke these insurrections (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 58). Introducing Gaomaata as Magi was due to this fact that Darius would recognize him as lacking the legitimacy and competence for the Imperial kingdom and that Herodotus considered Moghan to be Median resulted from Darius's misleading ideological propaganda, though neither Geomata was Magic nor Magis Median<sup>31</sup>.

5- Dandamayev regards the transfer of the Guamata capital from Persia to Med as the result of the tradition of the Achaemenid kings to go to Ekbatan cool air in the summer (Dandamayev, *ibid*.,200). It should be noted that Ekbatan had a cool climate during the summer and Cyrus the second moved there in the summer while Guatmata moved when it was summer and early in the autumn, when Ekbatan's climate was cold and unbearable. If he followed the old tradition, Gaumata should have moved to Ekbatan in the early summer, not late summer. In fact, the acceptance of Guamata from the side of the other nations (Babylon, Egypt and Armenia, etc.) made Geomati bold and reveal his being a Median<sup>32</sup>.

6- Dandamaeyev writes: Darius is introduced as the Savior from lies and chaos and not the Savior from the Medes, and Geomatia is the realization of the lie, not the Savior of the Medes.

Therefore, in the inscription, there is no evidence of Median being of the Geumata uprising (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 206). In response, it should be said that Kurdish revolts and their repression today are not introduced as the suppression of Kurds, but as the suppression of the agents of the aliens, the evil party, the corruptor on earth and the thugs. In contrast, Kurds are construed as the Iran's friends and martyrs of the political system. Dandamayev is not familiar with the Iranian political culture <sup>33</sup> that the political wisdom of Iran and Iranian leaders have always described their opponents under the name of the general concepts of liars, enemies, thugs, evil agents before and the agents of the aliens now and ... throughout history to have the legitimacy of oppression in the eyes of the common people. The Achaemenids used to speak about the shared domination of Mads and Pars in order to gain legitimacy and preserve their dominance in the Medes after dominating the Medes. Thus, the Achaemenid introduced the suppression and the slaughter of Magis not as the suppression and massacre of Medians and their uprising to save face and distort the minds of the Medians not to lead to another insurgent <sup>34</sup>. Today, the slaughter and imprisonment of Kurdish political activists are introduced as killing of drug and drink smugglers and terrorists. Darius's too much insistence on introducing Geumata as a Magi was due to this reason that makes him seem incapable in connection to ruling (Mashkor, 1375/1996: 155 and Olmsted, 1938). The other reason for introducing Gaumatus as a Magi and killing of Medes in Nasaya as the massacre of Magis was that Median hated Magis due to the traitor of Magis towards Astiag and helping Cyrius to rule Medians. Therefore, through introducing uprising as Magi's, Darius sought to diminish the legitimacy and authority of Guamata in Mad so that they do not rebel against his killing in Med. Darius' distortion does not only include the Guamata and recognizing him as being Ma-gi, but also it goes back to his lineage too. "Based on the evidence of the origin of Darius, Vishtasp, who is the son of Gushtasb is nicknamed as Vishtasp the son of king (Kent, 1953: 95)."

7- Dunmadyev says that since Darius has introduced Guamata as a Mog, he have not had a racially motivated view, but later Greek writers after Herodeut gradually have erroneously thought that the Mogs were only Median (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 209 ). Thus, the Guamata uprising which was introduced as Magi by Darius and Greek historians had considered Moghan to be Median, it was interpreted as Median. In response, should be said that the result of this argument is reversed. It was obvious for the ancient historians that Geomata uprising was a rebellion against Persian domination as there was fairly a little time interval between the historians and Geomata uprising. However, as some researchers pointed out, be-cause Herodotus had taken her information about the Guamata uprising from the descendants of the seven aristocrats of the Guamata murderers, and Darius had sent copies of the inscrip-tion of Bisotun to all countries, including Greece, on the one hand, the Median being of the uprising was clear for Herodotus and other Greek historians. On the other hand, the infor-mation derived from Darius's ideological propaganda introduced the insurrection as Median, the premise of the Median being of the Mogs was formed in the minds of the ancient writers. Therefore, not as Danmadyev states that the Median being introduction of the uprising by Greek historians was due to the Median being of Moghan, but it was also due to the fact that Geomata uprising was Median. "The emphasis on the fact that the Greeks considered the Guamata to be Mādī only because he was considered to be aMogi was completely baseless" (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 431). In ancient times, people also knew that all Mogis were not Median 35 (Danamadiyev, *ibid*: 209)<sup>35</sup>; thus, Knowing the Guatemala as Median by the Greeks has been an indicator of a historical fact (Aliev, *ibid*: 431). Thus, Donndamayef deductions does not necessarily lead to the results that he has deriven from them, and the inverse results can be derived from them. As it was pointed and Dandamayof also admitted it, most of the old and new historians had no doubts regarding Median being of Geumata uprising.

One of the strongest documents confirming the Median being of the Guamata uprising was the last will of Cambujia while returning from Egypt to the Persian elites. Cambujia "swore the Parsians that they would never allow superiority and domination to be transferred to the Medes; if they regained control of the monarchy with power, regain it with power, if with deceit, retake it with deceit." (Her, III, 65) "Gabries"as one of the Cambujia' accompanies re-grets the fact that the Persians go under the rule of a Median Magi (Her, III, 72) and (Hinz,1987, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 202). When Cambujia communicated this will to the Persian at the return of Egypt, the Farhurtish, Chiserma and other nations' uprisings had not began; these uprisings began after the suppression and killing of Gomaatha and Darius sitting in throne after September 29, 522 (Dandamayev, 1989: 191). Cambyeses' will was at the time of Guamata or Bardia the liar's action. It was perfectly obvious for Cambodia and Persia that the Guamata uprising was a Median uprising against the Persians who advised to restore the superiority and domination of Medians to the Persian.

As Dandamayev refers, all historical works point out that Guamata uprising was intended to revive the Median reign on the Iranians. The aristocracy of the Iranian became aware of this intention and, under the leadership of Dariush, killed Cyraus false son, thus consolidating Iran's domination and authority over the Medes (Danmadeyev, *ibid* 171 and 194). Accord-ing to the inscriptions of Bisotun and the Herodeot's views: Bardia was from the land of the Medes, and tried to restore the rule of the Median, and he relied on a common freeman and Medians (Diakonoff, 1985, in trans by Keshavarz, 1379/ 1998: 387). Herodotus considers the coup of

Geumata as a transfer of power from Persia to Med. (Herodotus, 230: 1387). Plato writes: Cambujia lost his rule to the Medes (Plato, 12, III, XII). He also emphasized that Guatemala, the Median Magi, hated the Persians and humiliated Cambujia (Plato, cited in Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009). "Straut", "Nyberg", "Spiegel", "Herthel", "Herzfeld", "Widngern", "Jackson", "Prasek", and "Oppert" accepted the Median being features of Guamata uprising (Dandamayev, *ibid*; 194). Tioryan writes, "Geumata created so much destruction in favor of the Median nobles that threatened the Iranian war machine and ... the exemption from military service for three years was to create a division between the Iranian army, that is, the same army which was in Egypt and this would disrupt the Cambyses's military base ... . Iranians opposed Guamata but did not have the power to act ... . Non-resistance of the army was also due to the fact that it was in Egypt at that time. "(Thiurin, in Dandamayev, *ibid*: 198-199). J. Austin believes that the whole inscription of Bistoun has spoken about the Median nations under the Achaemenids ruling to separate them from the Iranians." (Hermes 1938: 33)

Gaumatha settled in the castle of Sikaya Ovatush in the state of Nessia in Mede before being killed. Guamata saw his residence in Iran in danger, thus transferring the capital of the country to Med, since Iranians had taken an offensive side towards him (Dunker, 1867: 553 (Prasek, 1906: 265). The Median origins of the Guamata politics were revealed, or vice versa this forced him to transfer her residence to Med. (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 432). Gaumata first rose from Persia and then went to Med, because he could not reveal her median origin from the beginning (Markwart, cited in Aliev, *ibid*: 432). Bishtun's inscription says that Geumata was murdered in Mede at a place called Naseya (Beh, I, 57).

Here, we should have also pointed out to Farhuratysh and Chiserma uprising, who were both killed by Darius, but because we are only after proving the Median being of the individuals and groups uprising in this chapter. There is no doubt about the Median being of their uprising; therefore, we will avoid analyzing it here and postpone it to the following chapters.

Mazdak and Mazdakis' being Kurd:

Mazdak's movements was the greatest revolts of the poor and the farmers of the Near East in the beginning of Medieval centuries. This movement continued from around 494-495 up to 524 and according to some up to 528... its equality –seeking ideals erupted with the explosion of other popular movements up to centuries later (Ra'isNia, 1358/1979: 823). Despite the importance of this movement that targeted the basis of the class-oriented Sasanian government, there can be found no name of Mazdak up to four centuries after him in any sort of writings, but there is Moni's name. Moni's religion was not as dangerous as Mazdak's teachings for the authorities; thus, it was put aside (Klima, 1957, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 22-21). Christensen regarded Anushirwan to be the main agent of destroying Mazdak's writings and traces (Christensen, 1925, in trans by Falsafi, 1345/1966: 65). Anushirwan even ordered not to mention Mazdak's name in history books and it was the case up to seven century (Nadershahi, [www.etemad.ir](http://www.etemad.ir)).

In this chapter, as in other respects, we will merely provide proofs for Kurd being of Mazdak or at least the participation of the Kurds in the Mazdakis uprising, and we will discuss its nature and its way in the next coming chapters. Unfortunately, an important uprising such as this



without any traces up to four centuries later is solely introduced from the point of view of the ruling state which was disgusting under the name of the enemies of religion and civilization. Contemporary historians have also paid less attention to its ethnic / racial aspect; thus, the proof of its being Kurdish is very difficult, but this difficulty is true about the whole of Kurd history. Since we have not owned the pen and we have been rioting against the ruling states, the owners of the pen and the history who were the owners of the state and the authority have always rampaged our being and removed us from the scene of history. Now, by searching countless sources and by exploring meticulously in the footnotes and the random sentences in case of being too much creative, we can prove the being- the foremost right of every human being and nation – of our history.

Abur-Rihane Bironi, who writes the correct form of the name of Mazdak as Mazhdak (Klikam, *ibid*: 99) knows him to be from Nisa in Khorasan, which the scholars have rightly considered it due to mistakenly written spelling instead of Pasa. (Kliima, *ibid*: 180). Thus, Bironi's theory is not mentioned in any other source and has no base. Arab historians have identified Mazdak as from Shiraz. As Christensen has pointed out, a few centuries before Mazdak, a person called Zoroaster Khargan appeared in Pasa that has greatly influenced Mazdak thoughts based on Arab historians. In fact, the Arab authors considered Zoroaster Khargan as the main theorist who laid the foundations of Mazdak's religion and the man of action who has spreaded the new religion among the minor-people "(Christensen, *ibid*: 107).

Therefore, considering Zarathustra as being the contemporary of Mazdak and believing in two Mazdak is not correct, also considering him to be from the Pasa, is also not true, because Zoroaster was from Pasa, not Mazdak (Christensen, *ibid*: 107). Because they considered the two men as one and Zarathustrer Khargan being from Pasa was obvious, Mazdak was also considered to be from the Pasa. While Zarathushtra Khargan (who Mazdak directly took his religion of a person called "Zoroaster Khargan" (son of a Kharg) or "Zardhasht Bundes" around the year 300 BC) lived a few centuries before Mazdak and they had nothing to do with each other. Consequently, the idea of Mazdak being from Pasa also loses its credibility.

Altheim and Stiehl counted Mazdak to be Kharazmian based on the letter "zh" and according to Bironi's view that he has written Mazdak as Mazhdak <sup>36</sup> Klima rejects the theory of Altheim and Stiehl depending on the Assyrian inscriptions that one of them was published by Winckler (1907) and the other by Gesenius (1824). Elleris has seen the name of Mazdak in two Assyrian inscriptions written on the margin of a broken charter that the names of the tribal tax-paying chiefs of the eastern border of the Assyrian residing in Zagros has been mentioned (Klima, 1957, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 110). Klima writes that these names in the inscriptions of the Assyrian have been written in reference to the inhabitants of Zagros (Klima, *ibid*: 120) He considers the words Mazdaka, Mazdakes, Mazaios, Mazda not Iranian names but Medians (Klima, 1977, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1373/1994: 199-200). Mazdak names in Assyrian inscriptions refers to the Median princes (*ibid*: 200). Thus, it is difficult to accept Elteham – Eshtil's theory as they have called Mazria as Marghab (Yarshater, 1982: 214). Elteham – Eshtil's views are based more on speculation (*ibid*: 205)

According to the fact that the name of Mazdak has come in the Assyrian inscription, Klima counted Mazdak as Aramian while this name - Mazdak - was used about the inhabitants of Zagros not about the Assyrians themselves in the Assyrian inscriptions. Can it be said that just

because the name Diaco and other Median leaders in the Assyrian inscriptions they are also Aramian-Assyrian? Thus, the name of Mazdak is used about Zagros inhabitants and is a Zagrosic/Kurdish word <sup>37</sup>. AdwArthar Meyer" also regarded names the Mazdak in the archives of the Assyrian belonging to the 8th century BC as Median names (Childe, 1970, inTrans by Mohammad Taghi-ye Framerzi. Tehran, 1390/2011: 59-60).

As the other theories are valid, there is consensus on Tabarī's writing who has considered Mazdak as from Al-Madara in Madh (Klima 1957: in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 185). Tabri had reliable sources who considered him as from Al-Madara <sup>38</sup> (Christiensen, *ibid*: 107). Madara is the same as Madhraian on the left bank of the Tigris, which is now Kut –al-Amara (Christiensen, *ibid*: 108). The east or left coast of the Tigris is where Strabun and Btoleus called their inhabitants as Kurdovan <sup>39</sup>. It is a place where has always been permanent native land and the cradle of Kurds race (Nikitin, 1956, in traans by Qazi, 1373/1994: 100 and Minorosky in the Tabani, 1380/2001: 54), and the history knows no nation more ancient than Kurds in this area. (Speiser in Tabani, 1380/200: 67) 39. Lazarov writes that "during the caliphate (Umayyad / Abbasid) Kurdistan and its borders was un-changed like the era of the Sassanid Empire, and the Kurdistan region included Jezira, the Mesopotamia of the North, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Arabian Iraq and ... "(Lazarov,1930, in trans into Kurdish by Sangavi, 2010: 52). Jizira where the Lazarov considers as the settlement of Kurds from the time of Sassanid to theera of Arab caliphs is the same left bank of the Tigris or Kardoen, which was renamed as Jizra (the island) of Ibn Umar and Bhutan at the time of Islam (Khalil, 2011: 33). Thus, most of the people of the eastern Tigris ... were Kurds and Lors and those of the west Euphrates were Aramian and Syrianian throughout the Sassanid period, and constituted (Ibn-e Maskoya (n.d), in trans by Menzavi, 1376/1997: 7).

Therefore, although there is no references to Kurdishness of Mazdak in no known independent source, it seems that the comparison of the resources leads us to prove Mazdak as being Kurd. Mazdak movement and social insurrection was formed and continuig in an area where Kurds have always been living.

The book "Feudalism in Iran" writes that the Mazdak movement was formed only in the western and northwestern part of Iran, and there was no effect of the Mazdak movement on other parts of Iran <sup>40</sup>. Ibn Balkhi spoke about the escape of Mazdak to Azerbaijan during the coup of the Mobeds and Sassanid nobles that led to the ousting, escaping and imprisoning of Ghobad to "Hayatele". He, then, wrote tha, " Mazdak left the capital and went to Azerbaijan (small Mad) and later returned to the capital: "From the evil of this bad way, the world revolted against Ghobad and they reached out from all sides and the elders of Fars gathered, captured and jailed Ghobad. They gave kingdom to his brotherJamaseb and Mazdak fled to Azerbaijan (small Mad), and his proximate (curse be upon them) gathered together. He had a great glory and they did not succeed to do anything about him"(Farsnam-e: 85, cited in Rai'sNia, 1358: 823) <sup>41</sup>. Ater the defeat of the Mazdak movement, Azerbaijan (Minor Mede) turned into one of the major shelters of the massacre and the death saved masses of the Mazdak dynasty and as one of the active environment for the continuation of Mazdak ideology of Mazdak (Rai'sNia, *ibid*: 824). Khosravi also writes in the book "Mazdak that after their defeat, near Dinor and Azerbaijan (Monor Mede) was the center of the Mazdakians and then after their defeat in Jibal they went to Ray because it was the anti-Anaoshirwan positin (Khosravi, 13591980: 46) <sup>42</sup>. Azarbajjans is the geographical area of the small Mede where the scholars recognized its

inhabitants as mostly Kurds prior to the Turks' migration during the Seljuk and Mongol period<sup>43</sup>. In the Sassanid era, Kurdness of Azerbaijan is obvious based on the Marzban Azerbaijani treaty with Hazifa, one of the Omar's commanders, at the time of Omar whom Blazari has also pointed it out: "On behalf of all the people of Azerbaijan, Marzban made peace with Hazifa and he paid him seven hundred thousand dirhams provided that Hazifa would not kill take anyone captive, would not destroy Atashkadehs (fire temple) and would not trasperse on the Kands, Lazs, Sabals and Sattarodans, and especially would not prohibit the Shis people from dancing and stomping in the days of Eid and doing other ceremonies" ( Beladhuri, 9th century, in tran by, Azarnosh, Edited by Farzan. 1364/1985: 84). Beladhuri has pointed out that the Azerbaijani border guard, on behalf of all Azerbaijan (Minor Mede), ... if the Kurds would not be attacked .... Those Kurds who joined Mazdakis in Azerbaijan (Minor Mede), Jibal and Dinawar during the Sasanian period - they were, in fact, Mazdakis – there was a union of Iranian feudalism and Arab caliphate and a Turkish sword in the period of Islam and the Abbasid caliphate that flared up Mazdakids' revolt in the struggle with them <sup>44</sup>. Before turning to Khurdamdin and proving their Kurd being, we first need to point out a few words about Minor Mede (Azerbaijan) and how and when it changed into the place of the Turks. Since today, parts of Azerbaijan are Turks, we should avoid imagining that it has always been the Turk-inhabitat when using the name of Azerbaijan and we should notice that its historic past is separate from its present uninvited guests

#### Kurdish Minor Mede or Turkish Azerbaijan?

Seljuk Sultan Sanjar used the general name of Kurdistan in relation to the areas inhabited by Kurds for the first time in the 5th century AH. Before that, we can not find any sources stating the general name of Kurd including the historical geography of the Kurds. Did the lack of a general word of Kurd mean the real lack of the Kurds? The lack of a common term for Kurdistan in the century before 5/11 did not mean non-existence of Kurds nor Kurdistan, but rather it means the lack of relation between the name and being of the Kurds in the rule of the truth. Until the 11th and 12th centuries, when the Turks (Moghul, Saljogh, Turkmen and ...) invaded the region, the main inhabitants of Azerbaijan / small Mad and the main proprietors of its history are Mazdaka and Khuramdinans and the old Azerbaijani term had no ethnic / racial connotaton. After the assault of the Seljuks and the Mongols, its humanitarian map and identity changed to Azeri and Turkic gradually and with the force of the sword. Of course, it is now Turks' soil and land up to the places they have settled. The main argument is that the history before their inhabitants (Turks and Azeris) belongs to their main inhabitants, the Kurds including the history of Khuramdinans and the Kurdish dynasties, such as Rawadi and Shadadi and... . It is worth thinking that the word Azerbaijani preceded Turkic people in the region, but the term Kurdistan is more recent than Kurdish people.

We have already mentioned that renaming a region does not mean the change of the inhabitants and the language of the peoples of that area<sup>45</sup>. The geographic area, nowadays known as Azerbaijan, was called Roman and Greek by the Greek and Roman historians. Only from

Alexander's time onwards, it was named Atropath, Atrpatan, or Atropathan Mad as the result of the name of its governor. It was called Azarapatcan in Sasanian era, and then Azerbaijan (Pirnia, 1362/1983: 24 and 26). All ancient historians including Astrabon, Eryan, Yusuf Flavius and ... considered Azerbaijan as part of the land of Madad and called it Mad Atropatan (Reza, 1390/2011: 155). Bartold also considers Azerbaijan as an integral part of the land of Mada (ibid). We will first clarify the word "Azerbaijan and its historical root and this fact that this term had no racial, ethnic or linguistic connotation at all, and also it was derived entirely from the name of its governor. Up the 5th century when the Turks emerged, the inhabitants of that place were the ancient natives of Mede and Gutis whom we provided documents to prove them being Kurds <sup>46</sup>. Then, we will determine the geographical area and the race of its inhabitants and we will criticize Pan-Turkism views that are trying to give racial/ethnic denotation to the concept of Azerbaijan and trace back the history of Turks and Azeris to a pre-history period in the region.

### The genealogy of the word Azerbaijani

There are many opinions about the etymology and the reasons for giving such a name to this land. Some historians associate the emergence of this name with fire and fire temple in this land. For instance, Tabarī writes: "There were Ajm's fire temples there, and they called the fire as Azar. In Pahlawi language, they termed it as Azerbaigan where in fact Ajam had their fire there and worshiped it "(Tabari History, Vol1: 529). Yaghot Hammu also writes in al-Baladan: "Azar, in in Pahlavi is the fire and the baigan, means the guard, it was so-called, i.e. the guardian of the fire because there were too many fire temples there (Mo'jam al-Boldan: 159). Etemad al-Saltanah also emphasized the viewpoint of Yaghot (Ra'isNia, 1360/1981: 91)). **Charles le Beau** (1701-1778) writes, "worshiping this element - fire –which was the great goddess of Iran was nowhere so much prominent as in the ancient Azerbaijan (Atrpatkan), and it is due to this reason that they gave the name of Azerbaijan to this land. Azar means "fire" in Iranian language. "American Williams Jackson also confirmed the roots of Azerbaijan name from Azar and fireworshiping, "he has is considered the existence of hills in Azerbaijan to belong to the era of Zoroastrian fireworshiping, which was formed due to the density of the ash fire temples" (Jackson, cited in Ra'isNia: 92) <sup>47</sup>. Although Pourdawood rejected the theory of Yaghot, he accepted Azar's name in Azerbaijan. Bartholomew, Bogolyubov and ... also regarded the name of Azerbaijan as made from Azar, god of fire in Avesta (Ra'isNina, ibid: pages 90 on).

But the majority of the historians considered the root of the name of Azerbaijan, not because of the presence of a fire temple there, but due to the name of a personal called Atropath, the ruler of the Little Mad. The first person having a very clear account of turning the so-called "small Mad" to "Mad Atropatn" or "Aturupatkan", the initial form of the name of Azerbaijan, is Strabon who is a Greek geographer settling in Amasia or Minor Asia. He writes: "when the Achaemenid kingdom came to an end, and Macedonian Alexander ruled on Iran, a commander called Atropath rose up, and he prevented the land known as the part of the Medes soil called the Minor Mud from falling to the hands of the Greeks, and that land was later termed as "Attorpathan" (Strabo, cited in Gholizadeh, 1387/2008: 34). Azeri author Aliev also affirmed this: "The Medes were divided into two separate parts: a section called Major Mede, and the second part was Atropatkan Mede, whose name was taken from the leader of thier system named Atrpatkan. (Aliev, 1389/2010:105). Vladimirovich Bartold also writes about the

emergence of the Azerbaijani name: "The present Azerbaijan was a part of Iranian land of Mad as long as the time of Alexander the Great and it had no separate government during the Guagmal war (331, BC) when the Satrap (the governor) of the entire Mad was someone called Atropath. Atropat was still the ruler after Alexander, so the area under his command was inherited. A part of this region called the "Minor Mede" was known as Aturapatna-Atropatan, which the Armenians called it "Atropatcan". The name of Azerbaijan originated from here. Any attempt to present another explanation for this name is without foundation." (Bertold, 1963: 775-776). Zaki Waliyed Toghan, a researcher from Turkey, also quoting "Strabo" in an article "called Azerbaijan and its historical boundaries" in "Encyclopedia of Islam" regarded the name of Azerbaijan as tied to Alexander the Great. This name has derived from the name of one of the rulers of the Kayani-Iranian dynasty called Atropathan, in the year 328 BC. ruling the prov-inces of the land of the Medes from behalf of Alexander." (Togan, 1970: 93). Therefore, after the attack of Alexander, a part of the land of Med was given the name of its the Satrap, Atropatan (Reza, 123: 1382. Many other historians have confirmed this view <sup>48</sup>.

Therefore, the word of Azerbaijan is rooted in Atropatkan's name, the commander of the Mionor Mede. It is in the same way that Uzbekistan was named after the title "Uzbek", the Ottoman Empire after Osman and Colombia was termed after Columbus ... (Gholizadeh, 2008: 35). This word has come in the works of the Greek writers in the form of atropathene, in the middle Persian as Atropatcan, and ... in Siryani as Adobaigan, in Armenian as Atapapatcan, in Georgian as Azerbadgan, and in Arabic writings following the Syriac texts as Azarbanakan and Azarbijan, Azerbatan and.... (Gholizdeh, ibid: 37-36) <sup>49</sup>.

Thus, the name "Azerbaijan" is rooted in Azer (fire) and Baigan (guardian) meaning the guardian of the fire or it is rooted in the name of a person Atropathan, the ruler of the "Minor Mede" which later became known as Atropatcan and then Azerbaijan after him and his decendents' name. There is no racial/ethnic and linguistic connotation in naming Minor Mede as Azerbaijan <sup>50</sup>. Therefore, the existence of the name of Azerbaijan in the ancient period does not mean the existence of a nation or language in the name of Azeri or Turk. The name of Azerbaijan, which is rooted in Atropath or Azar, is in both an aristocratic root and it is difficult to establish a relationship between it and the native culture and mass of the inhabitants of that area. If we search the root of this concept - as we have already mentioned - in the name of Azar meaning fire and Baigan meaning the guardian of fire, we can not conclude that fireworshipping was widespread in Minor Mad. Fire and Worshipping fire is the result of the Zoroastrian religion and it is a ritual or religion from eastern Iran. Due to the adherence to the Mithraism and the snake worshipping totems, the Medians not only ousted Zarathustra from the Mede land, but they were nicknamed as Ajidak, Ahriman, etc in the Zoroastrianism <sup>51</sup>. The

Achaemenid Empire also tried to destroy the Medes' religion and Medi-anl culture with the Zoroastrian doctrine. Therefore, they sent the biggest fire temples and the best of Moghans to the Mede district to impose the Zoroastrian doctrine on the region <sup>52</sup>. Af-ter the collapse of the Major Mad and conquering its linguistic / ritual tradition focused on the Minor Mede and aristocratic Iranian families along with Magies moved there. Thus, the name of Azerbaijan, even if it is rooted in the concept of Iranian Azar, it is created and imposed by Iran, and even if some traces of Iranian / Azeri language can be found in its past before Turks' migration as some researchers <sup>53</sup> pointed out, it certainly has not been a Median language. Nonetheess, it has been the imposition of Iranian aristocracy and a pure language special to the Iranian ruling class and

it has had an administrative function, not taken from the Median masses of the Minor Mede. Unfortunately, since the owners of the pen and writings were not the farmer's masses and the indigenous inhabitants of that land, but they were foreign / Iranian imposed aristocracy, some works may also be discovered in connection with the Azeri / Persian language, which does not mean that the native language of that region was Azeri / Persian- Kasravi-. As the Turkish language was imposed on that area via the invasion of the Turkish masses in the 5th century, if we accept Kasravi's hypothesis about Iranianism and the old-ness of Azeri in the preceding centuries, Azeri language has been imposed by the Iranian governments and it is far different from its native/actual language. As Kasravi considers the Turkish language as a language imposed on the Native people of Azerbaijan, the Azeri language - of course, if there is such a language independent of Turkish - is the language imposed on the natives from beside the Iranians. The Pahlavi language replaced the Median language in the period after the Selukians in this region (Ra'isNiya's, *ibid*: 854). Marquardt considers the true essence of Pahlavi's language as the Azerbaijani language, which has been the written language of the Parthians (Markwart, 1373, 1388/2009: 415).

Therefore, the Azeri language is either Turkish or Pahlavi, which is not the indigenous or Median language, but imposed on Azerbaijan by Ashkanis when the Iranian religious aristocracy dominated the Minor Mede; Iranian Pahlavi language or Azeri was imposed on the region along with the abandonment of the native language there. The Zoroastrian preachers, along with the guards of the kingdom went everywhere all the time, including Antioch, Alban, and ... spreaded their religion through force in these lands (Grigorovich, 1969a, in trans by 'Enāyat-Allāh Reżā, 1350/1971: 131). Persian language was the language of religion and Magis, It was Magis that apparently had a leading role in the new government (Atropatan Mede). This has been reflected in particular names and so on, which had come to us, and it hides the various languages and dialects that were most likely still in use at that time.. But this new government has had an economic and political unity as before ... "(Diakonov, 2009: 416). Notice that Diakonov does not say that Median language was removed, but he utilizes the word "hide" in this case. Since the Iranian language imposed by the Iranian aristocracy and Magis was the language of the rulers and owners of the pen, it has concealed Median language but it has not vanished it. Therefore, it remained alive until the fifth century, not among the ruling classes of Arab, Iranian and Turkish, but among the masses of the people who were mostly Kurds. Even after the assault of Turks, the Oghozians and the Mongols, the Kurdish language is still common in parts of the land of Atropatan Mede where Manz also included Kurdistan though Fars is the official language at the level of the offices.

Al-Boladan in 278 H, considered the people Azerbaijan as a mixture of Azari, Ajam and Javedaniye al-Qadam (Hamavi, in trans by Gonabadi, 1362/1983: 36). Javedaniye Al Qadam was the same as Khormdinan. Thus, Hamavi that lived in 278 distinguished Khoramdinyan from the Azeri Ajam. Further, Arab historians addressed Iranians as Ajam. If He had spoken of Azerbaijanis people, he would have intended Iranians who resided in the territory of Azerbaijan like invading Arabs and they had migrated to the region after the Medes capture by the Achaemenids. More importantly, Hamavi has written that Javdanes-Khurdamin were older than Azari Ajams. Iranian language has certainly dominated the area during the past two hundred years of Iranian rule (Diakonov, 2009: 415).

Another theory that seems to be right is that not only no ethnic/linguistic connotation is derived from the root of Atropani Azerbaijani – like the theory of Azar + baigan = guardian of fire, but also it is the result of imposing Iranian aristocracy. Atropath was the ruler of the Medes from behalf of Achaemenid. Even if a Persian or an Iranian aristocrat and a friend of the Medes, like Harpag, was appointed by the Iranian government in Minor Mad, the word "Azerbaijan" did not have a special relationship with the linguistic / racial masses living there, and it is rooted in the ruling clan appointed by Iran. Therefore, in both theories, no the racial / linguistic relationship between the term imposed on Azerbaijan and the mass of people living there can be found. Even the atropat's argument - those who know its roots not in Azer and fire, but in the ruler of the atrophy – returns back to the same Azeri argument - those who seek the Azerbaijani root in Azar, namely fire. Purdavood regarded Atropat as the god of the fire. Atropat was appointed agent of the Achaemenid on the Minor Mad. This name is not a personal name of the agent who watched the fire temples but it is his Iranian title in guarding fire temples of the Minor Mede. Therefore, the root of Atropat returns back also to Azerbaijani. In each case, the theory of some historians like Kasravi, Purdavood, Strabonov, Aliev ... that that considered the root of Azerbaijan in the name of Atropat, the ruler of the Minor Mad, is not irrelevant to the theory of the guard of fire in the arguments of the other historians - Tabari, Hamavi and Jackson, and ... - they both originate from the same reality. Atropat has been the appointed ruler of Minor Mad and he has been appointed by the Achaemenids to preserve and promote the Zoroastrian religion, and to guard the imposed fire temples of the Zoroastrian doctrine in Minor Mad. The name Atropat itself is rooted in the guard of fire and was probably his nickname. "Atropat was the title of a person and had religious aspect and in fact he was a religious ruler. After him, other kings well ruled this region under such a title. It is also apparent from the sources that Atropat was the main center of the Zoroastrianism" (Reza, 1382: 124). The name of Azerbaijan is also from Atropat; hence, Azerbaijan is rooted in the guard of fire. Therefore, the oldest theory about the root of Azerbaijan's name goes back to Strabon, which is very new in relation to its oldest inhabitants, the Medes, are very new and it is after being captured by the Iranians, which Iranian historians take it as a source of it, and based on which they try to find its root in Iranian culture. Kasravi, who challenges Turkish origins of Azeri bases the essence of his argument on Iranianism of Azari, while it has been a foreign word itself in connection to the inhabitants of that land. The origin of the sources like Kasravi dates back to the period when the Minor Mad had been conquered by Iranians. If there was a historian prior to Strabon during the Medes ruling, definitely the word "Atropat" would not exist. The absence of the word can not be taken as having no meaning or content.

The main name of this region is neither Azerbaijan, nor the atropat, but it is the Minor Mad, a part of the permanent land of the Medes. Atropath was sent as a Satrap (governor) to that region in 328 BC (Reza, 1382: 124), while the rule of the Medes can be traced back at least 500 years before that date. Unfortunately, in the absence of archaeological discoveries, the information we have from the Median land is derived from the predominantly Greek historians who have written their works after the Iranian domination of the Medes and the changes made in that land. As they described Hegmataneh after Iranian changes and according to Iranian palaces like Persepolis, they described the culture and language of the Medes after Iranian domination and according to Iranian culture and language. Unfortunately, there has been written about the Median era as the prehistory time and its absence in the written history does not mean its real non-existence. Greek historians have also gathered information from the Persians oral source

after inflicting Iran's language and population on the Medes and they have issued statements about the cultural / linguistic similarity of Iranian and Minor Medians. Today's historians have confirmed these information as true regardless of the way Greek historians collected them.

Therefore, as we have explained, the word Azerbaijani has nothing to do with a particular language or people. What the Azeri language means is the Turkish language, or the branches of the Turkish language or the Ural-Altaic language. Separating Azerbaijani from Turkish is a constructed concept. The ideological warfare of Iran and Turkey, and the attempt to attract Turks and to prevent the Turks' independentism tendencies on the part of Iran, made them consider Azerbaijani language as distinct from Turkish language and trace its roots back to Medes era and before the Turks' migration to the region. Even if the Azeri language is separate from Turkish and a branch of the so-called Iranian languages, it has nothing to do with the indigenous inhabitants and it is still considered a language imposed on the region, with this difference not imposed by the Turks but by the Iranians. Therefore, if the Iranians do not recognize several centuries of the linguistic and human sovereignty of the Turks and seek to revive the Iranian identity before the rule of the Turks, the Kurds also have the right not to recognize several centuries of the linguistic, cultural, and human domination of Iranians and seek to restore the Kurdish identity of the Minor Mad.

Yarshater's argument about the Median roots of Azeri language is very humiliating and the ideas of Kasravi are very pan-Iranianist <sup>54</sup>, which both are equally unfounded, because, as we have already mentioned, many scholars <sup>55</sup> regard Kurdish language as the survival of Median language, not Azeri. The weakness of the defenders' arguments of the Azeri ethnic / linguistic theory before the fifth century AH is clearly evident from this writing of Mahyar Nawai: "Because this province (Azerbaijan) was called Azerbaigan previously, its language and its people have become known as Azeri from the ancient times" (Ra'isNia, the same 858), while, as we mentioned, it was not Azerbaijan from the old times, and after the Iranian domination on the Mede, it was called Azerbaijan or Atropatcan. Unfortunately, the historiography has started writing since Iranians ruled over Mede and imposed their language and culture on the region. Secondly, the existence of the word Azerbaijani does not mean that it is a connotation of the Azeri people. Many of the names of the regions are also Arabic or Turkish in Iran, do the Iranians accept that assume the people there to be always Arabs or Turks? Using or better to say abusing the name of Azerbaijan does not mean issuing a decree that the language and the people of old Azerbaijan were today's Azeri too. As we have proved, the Azerbaijani term has nothing to do with ethnic, racial or linguistic concepts.

Yaghot Hamavi says, "The Azerbaijani language was not understood except by the Azerbaijani people themselves"<sup>58</sup>. Spuler says some were called Kurds and the residents of a region were known as Kurds who had a vague language other than Persian, Turkish, and Arabic. Nobody knew their language (Spuler, 1952a, in trans by Falatori, 1377/1998: 436, 437). If the Azeri language had been as the Turks regard it as Turkish, and Iranians knew it as a branch of Iranian language, it would certainly have been understandable for Hamois and the like. As we will provide more evidence later, the majority of the Azerbaijani people were Kurds before the Turks migrated there in the 5th century, and as the result, the language prevalent in that area was also Kurd-ish, which, according to Hammu, has not been understood by anyone except the people there. As, according to Speller, Kurdish language was addressed to those who were neither Turk, nor Arab, nor Iranian, in the Seljuk period, the word Kurdistan were applied in a



humiliating-ly way for the regions that politically did not accept the sovereignty of Iran neither the Arabs nor the Turks. As the Islamic historians have pointed out, one of the parts of the geography defined as Kurdistan by the Seljukis was Azerbaijan. Thus, the people and the areas were called Kurds that were linguistically / ethnically and ethnographically neither Turks, nor Iranians and not the Arabs as they have undergone neither of their dominations and they have always been rebellions and insurgents from Achamenade Cyrus to Abbaside Khaliphate, Seljughs and Moguls. Therefore, a language that was not understood by anyone, in Hamavi's views, other than the inhabitants of Azerbaijan was most likely the same as the Kurdish language.

The language known as Azeri is the same Turkish language. Many Azeri / Turkish historians do not differentiate between the Azeri language and the Turkish language<sup>59</sup> "The language of Orkhon's writings - in Mongolia - is similar to that of the Turkish languages, and it has some sets of common features with the Azerbaijani language. It can be said the tribal language which is the basis of the general language of Azerbaijani people and especially the language of Oghoz tribe is close to the language of Orkhon inscriptions. "(Demirchizade, cited in Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 33). Turkish language is divided into several branches, in which Azerbaijani Turkish belongs to western group of the Turkish language family. Western branch of the Turkish language family including the Azeri language consist of the tribes of Caspian, Sabir, Sovar, Hun gun, Turk Ghazz, Aghoz, Ghebchak and ... Azerbaijani language like other languages of the western group has formed as the unique and common language of those people under the influence of the social and historical events (Demirvizzadeh, cited in Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 850-851). Thus, unlike some Turkish researchers who pursuit the existence of Turkish language until the Sumerian period in the region, the 11th-12<sup>th</sup> centuries after Hijra (AH) are the period of the formation of the Azerbaijani people ... "with the mass influx of the clans of Seljuk and Ghebchagh in the 11th and 10th centuries, (Turks) became majority. The Turks had come together in the 5th Century to formulate the common language of Azerbaijan on the basis of the Ughuz-Seljuk and and other languages are assimilated " (Hajiev: 17, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 883) <sup>61</sup>. Thus, even if the weak assumption of the equivalence of the Sumerian language with the Ural-Altaic is proven<sup>62</sup>, it has nothing to do with Azerbaijan. Sumer is in the south of Mesopotamia, which later it became the settlement of Semitic race, and it has no historical, geographical or linguistic connection with Azerbaijan (Minor Mede). Therefore, it seems that the language and inhabitants of Azerbaijan were Kurds before the Turks migration in the 5th century. Of course, given the ignorance of Islamic historians to those regions, and non-existence of written form of Kurdish language at that time, this conclusion is merely speculation, but perhaps it is the strongest guess and hypothesis that can be put forward based on the lack of resources.

Defenders of the theory of Turkish / Azeri being of the Minor Mad argue that "without the existence of a background of Turkish language in Azerbaijan in those centuries, the entry of the Turks did not lead to change in the language of these people. "(Ra'isNia, *ibid*:885). However, this may be the case, since Turks' invasion of Minor Mad (Azerbaijan) in the 12th and 11th centuries wasnot merely a temporary invasion and a political hegemony, but it was the massive migrations of Turks and Oghozes with a powerful military force that changed the structure of the language and the inhabitants of the region altogether. They massacred many of the natives of the region (Kurdish people), and this process was not temporary and it contin-

ued for centuries from the Seljuk to the Safavids. As Eraneski correctly pointed out in the introduction to the Iranian philology (p. 241). "Over the course of one thousand five hundred years ago, the languages of Iran were heavily under pressure and retreated against the Turkish language in the vast territories of Central Asia and the Plateau of Iran, and the languages of an important part of the Iranian people like Sogdian and Khwarizmians and South Azerbaijan have turned into Turkish." (Oraneski, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 887). He has presented his view regarding the language of Azerbaijan people becoming Turkish in this way: "During the Seljuk period, Turkic tribes appeared in the northwestern regions of the Iranian plateau and Azerbaijan, and there started the process of mixing the Turkish language with the local dialects of the South Azerbaijan. The number of inhabitants (Turks) increased especially during the Mongol era, and an important part of the Azerbaijani language became Turkish language patronage. Turkishization is also observed among the Kurdish tribes of Khorasan." (Oransky, 1960, in trans by Keshavarz: 238- 244).

### Kurdish Minor Mede

According to Diakonov, the land of Mada is geographically and historically divided into three distinct parts. The first part, called the western part or the Atropathen Mede, extends from the Aras River in the north to the Alvand Mountain in the south. It includes the Lake Uromia-Rezaiya- and Jaghto and other rivets that are entering it parallel to the lake as well as the area of the Ghezel Ozan Valley -Sefidrud- River crossing the Alborz Mountains near the present city of Rasht entering the Khazhar Sea. This area, which now includes Azerbaijan and Iran's Kurdistan, covers the mountain chains extending from north to south or from northwest to southeast. The Atropathan Mad is divided into 12 main geographic re-gions: 1. From Aras river to Averindagh mountains and Qaradagh, which includes the current cities of Qotor, Khoy and Marand. - 2 Gareh Sou river valley - Southern Branch of Aras Riv-er. -3 District of Urmia lake ... -4 Valley of the Ghezel Ozan River – White Sefidroud River - and its branches ... -5 Upper section of the small Zab River ... eastern chain of of Horizontal mountains ... From Urmia to the Diyala River ... Current cities between Duab, Baneh, Sulai-maniyah and Zahab and Sanandaj ... 6. Upper part of the Diyala River ... . The triangle of current cities of Sulaimaniyah, Zahab and Sanandaj, where Shahrezor near Sulaimaniyah were then more crowded in this part, and ... Zagros mountains towards Hamedan. 7 The middle section of the Diyala Route ... near the current city of Khanaqin and ... . 8. Upper section of Karkheh River: Mahidasht and Seymareh and Gamasiab ... Mountains of Lorestan ... . 9 lower Mad and Par-takanan areas including Hamedan, Isfahan, Rey and ... (Diakonoff, 1985, in trans by Keshavarz, 1379/2000: 79 onwards...).

The purpose of this quotations from Diaonoff's book is to say that the vast majority of the Atropattin Mad also form Kurdish cities in the current time. As we have already explained in detail, from Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions to Islamic historians and ... its Kurdish inhabitants, words like Kardou, Kardoqui, and Kurti, Gauti and Kurd have always been used to address the inhabitants of this area throughout history, but no documents from Turkic or similar languages have been used in address to the inhabitants of this border. Therefore, as Minursky has pointed out, the emergence of northwestern dialects of Iran has not taken place without the participation of the Median factor and the expantion and development of the Kurds has become possible only from the land of Minor Mad, that is, the same Atropatcan or the

present-day Azerbaijani (Minorsky, cited in Nikitin, *ibid*: 47). As we mentioned earlier, 63 this possibility that the main survivors of the Medes are Kurds is one of the current strongest hypothesis. If a language other than Kurdish had been common in the region and if that language had been Azeri Turkish at the present or in the past, it would have been due to the Turks' invasion from the 11th century BC onwards. If Azeri had been Iranian, which Kasravi and Aliev advocated it, it would have been as the result of the imposition of the Iranian speaking government system in the Achaemenid period - the Atropaths family - and later on that region. Diakonov also pointed out that the inhabitants of that area, namely the Atropatin Mad - like Mannayans, Lolubian, Kaspian, and the others - still considered themselves "Median" during the period of "Atropatin" dynasty and they retained their own characteristics. However, the Iranian language was a religious language and language of Mogis. Perhaps, it was the language that became famous as the ancient Azeri based on some like Kasravi- Qaderi. Thus, Mogis also had a leading role in the new government, i.e. Madat Atropatan, which made the language and dialects that were most likely prevalent that time in Medncaled. (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 416).

Diakonoff sees the northern boundary of Atropatan Medes as up to the Aras river. But where was the geographical area of Azerbaijan (Minor Mede) on the northern border? Mo'jaem al-Boladan considered", the border of Azerbaijan, ... from the north to Bard'e, from the east to Dilam and from the south to Tarom and Zanjan ... Ibn-e-faqih has counted " Barda'i "and" Del Arran "as a part of Azerbaijan city. Zakaria Ghazvini has introduced Arran between Azerbaijan, Armina and ... "(Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 77). Ibn Asir also while speaking on the war with in the chapter on Fazlon-Alkurdi's war considered Azerbaijan a part of Azerbaijan (Ibn Asir, the events of 420 and ...). Ibn Hoghel has identified three aforementioned territories - Armenia, Aran, Azerbaijan – as one realm because it was always under the rule of <sup>64</sup> one-person, from Ibn Abi al-Sajj to Disam Bin Shazelvyyeh and Marzban ibn Mohammad Salar ....

It is clear from the texts that the lands on both sides of the Aras river were a geographic and political unit during the Islamic era that had a close political, cultural and ethnic linkage. This situation continued until the successive waves of Salajaq came along and defeated the local governments of Azerbaijan and Aran. Aran also joined Azerbaijan. The massive migrations of Turkish speaking people to both lands, the intensification of the widespread process of Turkish language spread, the formation of the Azerbaijani language and the retreat of local languages that provided a suitable condition for accelerating the process of a comprehensive cultural and ethnic communication on both sides of Aras river was reinforced after Mongol invasion. Aran, which became a part of Azerbaijan, even lost his name. The name of Qarabagh took the place of Aran. The Greeks put the name of Albania on this area. Then (in the Islamic period), it turned into Aran and (in the Mongol era) to Qarabagh, which included Shakki, Shirvan, Ganjah, Daghestan, Nakhchivan, and so on. In the era of FatehAliShah, it was the Provinces of Iran and later it joined Tsarist Russia according to the Golestan Treaty (1828-1222) And Turkmen-Chai Treaty (1828 – 1243) (Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 87 and 88). This territory was called the Independent Republic of Azerbaijan in 1918 and the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan in 1920. The Russians gave it the name of Azerbaijan (*ibid*: 89).

The scientists of the Soviet Union considered the people of Albania (Aran) as composed of Utah, Caspian, and .... tribes. Diakonov knew all of them – as mentioned before - Medians. Uti is the same as Guti, that is, it is the result of the fall of "K" from its beginning that is special to the Zagros mountainous languages. The Eilamite language also has such a character (Aliev,

1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 97). Otians lived in the south of the Aras river in Azerbaijan (Minor Mede, Ghaderi) where earlier, according to information from the Sumerians and Akadians, Gothians lived there. In Armenian sources, sometimes the Albania was called Oti, Albanians and Otians. Therefore, the ancient Gothian of Azerbaijan ... are the same later Utians of the South of the Transcaucasian. Gutians were severely weakened after centuries of predominance in Mesopotamia. At the end of the 22nd century BC, they were put out from that region and they returned to their home country in the mountains of Kurdistan and South Azerbaijan and after conflicting with residents there, they set off to the south of the Transcaucasian region in search of a secure place in the north. The resources of the Urartu called them Ethians after more than one thousand years. Herodotus mentioned the name of Otians residing in the southern regions of Aras in the 5th century AD. They settled in Albania after 500 years, and the medieval writers called the whole Albania as Oti and the Albanians as Otians (Aliyev, the same, 97, and 98). Herodotus stated the name of Caspian, Mukhvi and Otian tribes in the sixth and fifth centuries BC in the eastern Caucasus (cited in Reza, 1382/2003: 135). These three ethnic groups formed the basic core of the inhabitants of the region that was later called the Albany (ibid: 136). The oldest mention of the Kashi people dates back to the third millennium BC. Strabo identified the place of Caspians in the eastern part of the Caucasus and the borders of the Caspian Sea, and most researchers identified their land as the same with the Patyikaran –Kaspak - region between two rivers of Kor and Aras, and the Caspian Sea (ibid: 137). Therefore, the main inhabitants of the Albanian region that later was called “Aran” were Utians, that is, the same as Gutian Kurds and Kasis / Caspians, which were also Kurdish main tribes. According to Strabo, the ancient name of the Caspian Sea is related to the same name (Kaspian) (Strabo, 1984: 4).

Herzfeld asserts that "ass" was pronounced as "asp" in the Median language. For this reason, kass has changed into kasp. (Herzfeld, 1968: 195). The people of Kaspi were clans of the Kassian tribes; the word "Pi" means water bank and Caspian can be considered as the Kasis by the Sea (Reza, 1382/2003: 138). We have already stated that the Casis and Gutis were the main inhabitants of the Medes. Caspians and Gutis have lived in these districts since 3000 BC, while Iranians' migration to these areas cannot be traced back to two thousand years BC. Thus, the Caspians and the Utian inhabitants of the Albania were not Iranian but they were Median/Kurd<sup>65</sup> and they gradually faded away after Iranian occupation and migration until they were vanished forever after the invasion of Turks.

Albania was a non-Aryan land (Markwart, 1901, in trans by MirAhmadi 1373/1994: 117), whose main people (Albania, Arran) did not have any association with any of their great neighbors. Iranians penetrated into this area to defend their borders in the time of the Achaemenid and then the Sassanid. The memory of the fortifications of that area, namely, Darband (in the Armenian, Joor and in Arabic, Bob), and many of its gates remind us of the Sassanid kings, i.e. Kavat-Ghobad – 538 - 488 and Anushirvān. The appointed puppet Amirs organized the issues and the term Tabarsaran, Shah Khorassan and ... refer to the first class of these indigenous stooges and some of these tribal names are not taken from the names of the main tribes of those regions, but they are derived from the name of the alien aristocracy of Iranians (Qaderi) at the top (Minorsky, 1953, in trans by Khadem, 1387/2008: 21-20). In Sassanids time about a thousand Median family were displaced to the Aran region (Minorsky, ibid). The Sassanians moved Persian people to Albani in order to keep there under

their control and to create their own backing there (Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 19). In the last years of the Sassanids rule, the Mehrani family, a branch of the Sassanian dynasty has commanded the Caucasian Albanians (Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 33). Sassanid kept large military units to defend this passage; further, they built forts in the country's internal divisions, and deployed military units there. The cost of these units was on the native people of this place. Sassanid kings used to settle the Iranian tribes in strategically important places to create supporters (Babayev, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 19-20). Apart from the the rule of Albani Mehrani, the border guard stooge in the Sassanid court was Shahrbaraz that was from the people of Fars (Persia) and from the family of Shahrbaraz (Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 34). Anoushirvan, who had previously transferred the Turks to Azerbaijan and the South Caucasus, sought settlement policy of Persians in this land in order to make them minority and he settled a Persian society called "Siasija" here, and also a crowd of Sogdians in the vicinity of Tiblisi, he moved the Turks to the more indigenous territories of Iran (Toghan, quoted from Ra'isNia, the same). Belazori has asserted that Siasijan or the Persian society were still rulers in Aran until the advent of Islam and afterwards they abandoned their fortresses (*ibid*: 21). After Islam, 24,000 Arab armies were also displaced there and there was captured by the Arabs whom they called Darband as "Baba al-Aboub and albania" as Aran (*ibid* .: 22)

"Barda'e", the next capital of Albania, was established by someone called "Vache" (a Horamiye word meaning "say", Qaderi) in the Sasanian age. The Yazdgerd II, the Sassanid king, forced Vache, the king of Albania, to accept the Moghan religion (Reza, 1386/2007: 268). In the year 461 AH "Vakhe" became rebellious and lost his throne and the Sasanians themselves ran his country "(Minorsky, *ibid*: 19-18). Thus, the Albanian region (Aran), which both geographically and linguistically / racially was part of the Medes, came seriously under linguistic / demographic and political attack of Iranians. The presence of Iranian invaders in the Caucasus at the vicinities of gates played an important role in attracting or retreating the main inhabitants (Minorsky, *ibid*: 22). Thus, the first foreign invaders entering the land of Minor Medes (Azerbaijan and Alabaniya) were Iranians, who forced the masses of the inhabitants of Gutii, Caspian and ... (Kurd) to retreat or assimilate them in the ruling culture and language. Therefore, the Albany region has been under the control of the Achaemenid government since the time of Darius I (Reza, cited in Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 33). Before that, we have had no evidence of its connection with Iran and Iranian culture; hence, along with Iranian political domination, the Iranian people, language and culture also little by little influenced the ruling administration of that area.

Therefore, both sides of the Aras river were ethnically and ethnically homogeneous. Kurds were also present on both sides of Aras river in the early Islamic centuries (Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 42). The Kurds still live in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Armenia, and the name of many places are compound words formed with Kurds on the two sides of the Kor river (Minorsky, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 43) The Kurds infiltrated in Azerbaijan in ancient times and even crossed the Aras river, and it seems that the Kurds, with a more permanent settlement in Azerbaijan, protected it against the invaders of the Caspian provinces (Minorsky, cited in Ra'isNia: *ibid*). Ganjavi's mother was also from Kurd race as he indicated this point in the preface to the Masnavi of Laili and Majnoon:

In case my mother called Ra'isa, a Kurd                      died in a motherly way by me as you heard

Sharfkhan Bedlisi also pointed out to the residence of twenty-four groups of Kurds in Qarabagh (Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 43). But Bartold considered the Aras River not only as the natural boundary, but also as the ethnic and racial boundary: "Aras River, that now separates Iranian Azerbaijan from the Caucasus, was a decisive ethnic and racial border between the land of Iran and the Medes and the land of Albania in ancient times. According to N. Yamar, the Albanian people were from the tribes of Yaphtis (Barthold, 1984: 775). "Barthold's view can not be true and there existed no specific ethnic and racial border between two sides of Aras river and it has always been non-Aryan / Iranian. As we said, Marquardt, like N. Yamar, considered the Albania a non-Aryan land (Markwart, 1901, in trans by MirAhmadi, 1373/1994: 117). But centuries of Iranian political domination and, as we have pointed out, the settlement of Iranian immigrants in these regions, Kurd's settlement hegemony was lost in areas closer to Iran and with greater possibility of emigration and domination. Based on the official written sources that are the archives of the ruling system, this side of Aras River have been considered as similar to Iranian language and culture and as the result Iranian.

The northern part of the Minor Mede (Azerbaijan) underwent profound linguistic / racial changes with the invasion of the Turks and Mongols (5. E. 11 BC). The invasion of the Turks / Moghols, unlike the Iranian invasion some centuries before, was not merely a political / linguistic assault, but a population / demographic attack, and, unlike the cultural / linguistic and political domination of Iran, they gained ethnic domination through the killing of residents of that area in many places. The native demography of those areas were transformed during the Seljuk, the Mongols and Timurid periods and brought large areas of land under their possession in the west of Iran Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1979/2000: 143).

During the time of Wahsudan in 416 H, the first wave of migrating Turks of Ghaz arrived in Azerbaijan, and they were going to completely change the demography of that place. The second wave of the Turks, which was stronger occurred under the command of Bugha and ... in 429 H, 1037 BC and they looted the country. In 429, they looted Maragha and killed the inhabitants of the city. They massacred many Kurds and looted their villages (Madelung, 1997, in trans by Namaie, 1379/200: 206, 207). They killed large groups of Kurds (Reza, 1390: 230). Apart from the migration and invasion of the Arab tribes, Turks and Mongols raided those areas during the Islamic era in the 5th and 6th centuries In 458, when the Turks raided Shervan, its residents were Kurds and they plundered the Kurds' houses (Minorsky, *ibid*: 63 and 87). With the entry and replacement of Turkic tribes, the Turkish language spreaded in Eran and Sharwan and the area of Darband and Daghestan, and later on dominated native languages (Reza, 1382: 530). Thus, the Turkish language tightened its pressure on local languages in the centuries 11-112th BC, 6-5th centuries AsH (*ibid*: 532).

Therefore, the newly-built seedlings of Turks and Mongols were watered / only with the blood of Kurd in the Minor Mud area (Azerbaijan and Aryan). As many historians have pointed out<sup>64</sup>, and we will come to it later, in the Islamic period, before the invasion of the Turks / Mughals, the majority of the inhabitants of Azerbaijan and Eran and Sharwan were Kurd and this is quite evident from the governments and emirates under the control of Shadadian and Rawadian <sup>65</sup>.

When Arabs defeated Iran army in the war of Qadesia, Rostam, commander of the Iran Corps, proposed Yazdgerd to retreat to Azerbaijan (Minor Mede), but Yazdgerd headed to Khorasan due to this fact that the inhabitants of Azerbaijan were Mazdakis and he was uncertain about

their support (Kasravi, 1356: 46). who were the inhabitants of Azerbaijan whom Sassanid king had no hope in their support, and, like Darius III, after being defeated from Alexander, went to Khorasan instead of the Minor Mad and the Ekbatan? As we discussed earlier, Azerbaijan is rooted in the name of the Atropath, the Achaemenid Satrap of the Minor Mad there is no ethnic / racial connotation in it. We also noted that the inhabitants of Azerbai-jan were the natives of Madi/ Guti prior to the arrival of Islam where were Kurds according to the majority of scholars. If Iranians or the Iranian language had penetrated it, it has been due to political domination, the influence of the Iranian element and it has been limited to the rul-ing aristocracy. Nonetheess, what ethnic / racial group was Azerbaijan composed of in the Is-lamic period?

Most of the population of Azerbaijan were Iranians <sup>66</sup> during the conquest of Arabs, and most of their various dialects were Kurds (Madelung, *ibid*: 196). Kurd being of Azerbaijani people was evident in a contract between Azerbaijan border guards (Marzban) and Hazigha, the commander (Sardar) of Omar (second caliph): Marzban (of Azerbaijan) made peace with Hazigha on behalf of all the people of Azarbaijan and paid seven hundreds thousands Der-ham provided that Hazigha do not kill and capture anyone and do not ruin the fire temples and do not attack the Kurds of Lasjan, Sabalan and Satrodan and especially do not prevent the Shiz people from dancing and dancing during the Eid (feast) days and other occasions (Beladhuri, in trans by Azarnosh, 1364/1985: 84). In this agreement, which Blazari points it out, the Azerbaijani border guard made peace for all Azerbaijanis on condition that Kurds are not attacked.

After the conquests of Islam and the replacement of numerous Arab, Iranian and Turkish dynasties, the Kurdistan and Azerbajan regions have always been rebellious, and they have accepted the sovereignty of none of the rulers excep in appearance. "Throughout these centuries, the whole of Iran and what was beyond the domain of the Ghaznavids and Samanids, in particular (Jebal and Azerbaijan, Qaderi) was the activity scene of the Kurd tribes and the tribes of the "Shabankarai"". Albeit, they did not have any difference with the primitive Arabs and tribes of Turks and Ghaz in terms of the pastoral and nomadic life; however, signs of local and ethnic culture linked them to Iran and the ancient world in terms of race, language and customs "(Zarrinkob, 1368/1987: 331). Of course, the common name of Iran is constructed based on Iranism-oriented mind of Zarinkob. " In general sense, what is called Kurd among these tribes ... included all the clans of Shabankara, who were shipherds and did not have a habitat in the city; nonetheless, in the specific meaning, this title implied a reference to the unique and specific ethnic element that has been present everywhere in the Zagros areas since the early Islamic era with itsspecial linguistic and cultural features and with its ethical and ritual characteristics. Kurdkai, Sumerian inscriptions, Kurdkhoi, Xenophon, Amade and Parsowa (Assyrian inscription-Qaderi) all are references to the same Kurds "(Zarinkob, *ibid*: 332). As we have said, the concept of Iran is the construction of Persian historians, while ac-cording to the above mentioned references from Zarrinkoub himself, Kurdokhoi and Amadi have the same origins which expresses the relations of Azerbaijan people with Gutis and Kurd. Zarinkob continues to acknowledge the majority of Kurds in the regions of Azerba-jan, Aran and Jabal (Minor Mad) during the Abbasid period and up to the beginning of the end of the demographic / political hegemony of the attacking Seljuk Turks. "In the first centu-ries of Islamic history, the role of Kurds in a special not in the general sense, ... and their housing included from around Zagros mountains to Azerbaijani, Aran, and Darband (Dage-stan) regions, and in these areas there were generations of Kurds who have had long or short governments or have been as

warriors in the system of non-Kurdish rulers ... they have had agreement with the Kharijites because of their ideological consistency with their shepherd nature. Their role is evident in the rebellion of the owner of the Zanj (dignitaries), Daisam Hassanvayyah in Dinor, Shadiyan and Rawdian in Aran and Azerbaijan ... the era when the rise of Tugril Baig Seljukhi ended it ... "(Zarinkob, *ibid*; 333). Therefore, the hegemony of the Kurdish population in Azerbaijan before the Seljuqs is acknowledged. Kurds from Iranian lineage were present in both sides of Aras in the early Islamic centuries (Ra'isNina, 1380/2001: 42). Minorski also considered the main backbone of Babak's revolt as people of a warrior nomad and regarded the main shelter of the Kurds in the south of Armenia-Aras, the same region of Babak's rebellion.

As the historians have pointed out, the inhabitants of the land of the Minor Mad (Azerbaijan Aran) have always been insurgents against the rule of the Caliphs and their puppet emperors (Taherian, Samanids, Ghaznavids, etc.) <sup>71</sup>. One of the most important insurrections in these areas was Khorram-Dinan rebellion following the Javidyanids and Mazdakis were Kurds like the Shadadians and the Rawadians (we will focus on the Khoramdinan independently). If there had existed a non-Kurdish government in this area, it would not have been because of non-Kurdish residents, but because of foreign political domination. One of the foreign / imposed families ruling on behalf of the Khalifa because of their participation in the crackdown on Khurdamin in Azerbaijan were Sajians. "Abu al-Sajj - the Sajian dynasty – had authority on behalf of Khaliphte in Azerbaijan. He was from the tribes of Ashursneh and relatives of Afshin from the Sughd tribe who showed a significant valor and violence during the wars of Afshin, Khalifa's commandar, with the Babak Khoramdin Corps – 221. After the capture of Afshin, he remained loyal to the Calipha and placed his sword under the command of the Abbasid caliph (Zarinkoub, 1384/2005; 303). Muhammad ibn Abi al-Sajj had become the agent of establishing order in Azerbaijan and Armenia from about 79 276 e. from behalf of Moetamed the Khalifa. He was able to bring the provinces of Azerbaijan, Aran, and Armenia under his control with help of his brother, Yousef (Ra'isNia, 1380/2001: 380). After the extinction of the Sa'jyans family (the non-indigenous dynasty - Qaderi), Azerbaijan fell to the rule of Disman ibn Ibrahim Shadlevyeh, a Kurd from Khawarij (ZarinKob, *ibid*: 326).

#### Kurd being of Rawadians

Before focusing on Rawadian, we should have some brief remarks of Kurdish Daisam. As we mentioned, the Sajian was a non-indigenous government imposed by the caliph. But, how did he get to rule in Azerbaijan? <sup>67</sup>. Historians have pointed out that Daisam managed temporarily to rule there as the result of the majority of Kurds in Tabriz and Azerbaijan (Madelung in Fry 1379/2000: 203, 202; Zarinkob, *ibid*: 310; Kasravi, 1377/1998: 60, 64 – 65). Marzban got along with Daisam since he had the support of Ardebil and Tabriz Kurds (Zarinkob, *ibids*) and Wahsudan Al-Almosafer sent Dism to Azerbaijan against the attack of Muhammad ibn Abdul Razak from Tous to Azerbaijan as he knew Azerbaijan very well and he had the support of the Kurds there (Madelung, *ibid*: 203, Kasravi, *ibid*). Therefore, Daisam was not only a foreign ruler from behalf of the caliphs, but he was from Khawarij (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 326) and father of Daisam was one of the aides of Aaron Waziqi, the chief of Mosul Khariji and Disman, like his father, had a foreign religion (Madelung, *ibid*: 201) and he had no belief in the caliph and the



caliphate (Kasravi, the same, 60). His frigid sovereignty was made possible as the result of his being Kurd and he was also co-language and co-race of the majority of residents of Azerbaijan.

After Daisam's failure to establish a stable government in Azerbaijan, Rawadis, that many of the historians have known these places to be Kurds, came to power based on the dominance of the Kurdish element in Azerbaijan (Madelung, *ibid*: 205). With the decline of Al-Almosafer, their realm fell to the hands of Rawadi Kurds and with the prevalence of the Azerbaijan Kurds, he abstracted the power from the hand of Dilmians (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 313). Abu Alhija, the Kurds leader (Madelung, *ibid*: 207) seized the border guard with the help of the Kurds, and he ended the power of the Salaris in Azerbaijan with his imprisonment and murder -370, and with the domination of Rawadi Kurds, the reign of the Salaris of Deylami (Deylamis are not from Azerbaijan, but their settlement is in the north of Iran, Qaderi) came to an end in Azerbaijan (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 314). Rawadians were Azerbaijani Kurds and with their conquest, a generation of Kurds took the place of Dilmians in the Emirate of Azerbaijan. Long term glory of Daisam could not lead to the creation of a Kurdish dynasty in Azerbaijan, but the Abu Alhija al Rawadi's conquest realized it (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 315). It is true that Rawadis came to power in the fourth century AH, but the permanent inhabitants of Azerbaijan and before that were removed from the political scene due to his opposition with the caliphs. "Ibn Rawad's sons were well-known in the events of the Qaroon and Ma'mun times in Azerbaijan. Gradually, after the events of Babak's uprising, their fame came to an end. During the era of Al-Sajah's conquest, the castle of Baz was destroyed and Tabriz's areas exited from under their control"

(Zarinkob, *ibid*: 316). "Three sons of Rawad, Wajna, Yahya and Mohammad revolted at the time of Harun al-Rashid in Tabriz and Azerbaijan... Blozori writes Wajina and his brothers established foundations in Tabriz. Ibn Nadim says that Babak worked in Tabriz for two years with Mohammad ibn Rawad and then returned to his mother" (Kasravi, 1377/1998: 135). IbneKhordad ba, who wrote his book in 234 AH, in counting the cities of Azerbaijan considered Tabriz as belonging to Mohammad the son Rawad (Kasravi, *ibid*). Thus, Kurdish Rawadis have been the rulers of Tabriz and Ardabil many years before Babak, but there is no name this family till the next century until Abu Allah was recognized as Ahar and Varzaghan's lord and became king of all Azerbaijanis (Kasravi, *ibid*: 136).

But there are many doubts about the lineage of Rawadian, not only the Arab and Persian historians, but also the orientalis of Europe who have been exploring and compiling books, have never known him (Kasravi, 1377, 115). Kasravi writes in reply to find out the reasons for Rawadi's remaining in vague: "Since 369, when Ibn Maskowieh finished his history book "Tarikho-al Omam, until the year 420, when Ibn Asir first mentioned the name of Wahsudan, the history of Azerbaijanis is quite dark. 50 years after the fall of Salaris and the kingdom of Rawadian are among the events of this dark period, there is no trace of the Persian and Arab historians ... Orientalists, who have read the book of Ibn Maskowye and then suddenly they have seen the name of Wahsudan, the lord of Azarbayjan in the Book of Ibn Asir..., have considered Wahsudan the survival of Salaris family, especially since Wahsudan is one of the names of Dilmians, they have assumed Mamalan also as one of the names of Dailami. Kasravi also admits in the book "Azeri or the ancient language of Azarbaigan" that he has mistakenly assumed Wahsudan and Mamlan as Dailami ... then I realized it as conjecture and those two Amirs were from separate families called rawadian and as we have seen they have ruled over Azerbaijan since centuries earlier (Kasravi, *ibid*: 116).

Kasravi considers Rawadis as from Arab race and believes there were two important Arabic and Kurdish Rawadis in the 4th and 5th centuries in Azerbaijan. One of them was of the Azdi Rawadi who had Arabic origin and the other who were the family of Muhammad bin Shidad, i.e. the rulers of Aran and Shadiyan and they were from Kurdish race (ibid:132) <sup>68</sup>. The only weak argument of Kasravi in considering Rawadis as two separate families is his reliance on Ibn Khalkhan, who wrote the name of this tribe “a” over “r” and “w”, a “w” without stress and also different from Tazi (Arabic) Rawadi "(Kasravi, ibid: 226) which definitely is not a convincing reason in regarding Rawdians as two distinctive clans.

In response to Kasravi, Zarinkob writes: "because of the predominance of non-Arabic elements in Azerbaijan, Rawadis were transformed from Arabic to Kurdish decent". Given that "Taherians displayed themselves as Arabs in Khorasan, the transformation from the Mavalat of Ezdi tribe to Kurdish decent and race Kurdish was not strange and did not make any problem in the racial environment of that place" and "The predominance of non-Arab elements in Azerbaijan of that era could well justify the racial transformation of Rawadi Abolhaija's progeny from Arabic to Kurdish lineage ... "Zarinkoub Adds that "this point that, in some of the later narratives, Kurds lineage have been traced back to Arabs has apparently been the justification for Ezdi Arabs becoming Kurds among the Rawadis "(Zarinkoub, ibid: 316, 317 and the footnote of 558). Minorski also realizes Rawadis becoming Kurds as the result of Kurds domination and hegemony. "For the Arabs isolated in Azerbaijan, marriage with local elements was natural, as far as al-rawad al-Azdi lost its true meaning and al-rawad al-Kurdi replaced it (Minorsky, 1944, in trans by Behzadi, 1378/1999: 165).

Besides, he writes: "Although Mohammed bin Shidad was a Kurd, it does not seem that he had a direct relationship with the Tabrizian Rawadis. They had Arabic decent, and they found Kurdish decent through local marriages" (ibid: 48). Taking preliminaries of Zarinkoub and Minorsky as true, the result derived from these prepositions is illogical and a reversed argument. Minorsky and Zarinkoub acknowledged the hegemony and a linguistic/ethnic majority of the Kurds in Azerbaijan and the Aran, and they considered the dominance of the non-Arabic Kurdish- element – as because of the racial transformation of the Ezdi Arabs to the Kurds, and they gave some examples that are against their own argument. This issue that Taherian traced back their decent to Arabs was based on the Arabic cultural / linguistic hegemony in the whole world of Islam, but certainly no Arab was proud of being Kurd – which in that period was a humiliating name- similar to the Tour. It was true that the Kurds formed the majority of Azerbaijan population, but this would not bring political / cultural legitimacy so that Arabs would like to attribute their decent to the Kurds. Thus, it was Kurds who attributed their descent to the Arabs and forged fabricated lineages for themselves. A lot of Kurds families became Shaibani - Arabs – through forging fake genealogies (Translator's Introduction on Tajarob-al Omam of Ibn-e Meskoya, Menzawi, 1376/1997: 8 ) like Kurds of Rawadis that made Arabic decent for themselves. In Khorasan, the Persians were the majority, while, as Zarinkoub himself points out, Arabs not only did not make fake any Persian racial origins for themselves, but Taherians attributed their origins to the Arabs. It is also a reversed argument that the Arab historians - the Mas'udi and ...traced back their descendants to Kurds since many Kurds, due to the cultural / political domination of the Arabs, have brought back their origins to the Arabs <sup>69</sup> and the Arabic origins of the Kurds were created by Arab historians.

Therefore, we have no, as Kasravi says, two separate tribes or ethnicities and neither the ancestors of Rawadis, as Zarrinkoub writes, were sArabs. But only there was only a Rawadi tribe whose ancestors, abandoned by the Abbasid caliphs and hidden in the history, have made lineages to achieve legitimacy of the government from the Caliphs, whom every kind of legitimacy was subject to the Caliphs approval like the Taherians, the Safavids, and even today's ruling regime in Iran. In the vast majority of sources - we will continue to discuss it - if we do not take Kasravi's imaginative creations seriously, the historian writings have been transcribed ten times before getting to Kasravi - ethnicity and language of a people has been faked, two Rawadi tribes have been considered separate from each other and there has been no reference to Arab being of Rawadis. Rawadis have been a Kurd clan whom they may have introduced their race as Arab for political legitimacy and this can not be the reason that they are Arabs.

Kasravi himself, referring to Ibn Muskuīyya, who was living in the same developmental period of that age of Azerbaijan, and quoting Ibn Amīd, repeated this point that Azerbaijan Kurds were numerous and dominant. (Kasravi, *ibid*: 102). Further, Ibn 'Amīd and Ibn Masakui regarded Abu al-Hajjah as Kurd (*ibid*: 102). Kasrawi questioned Ibn Meskūyī and Ibn 'Amīd's ideas, who lived in the same period of Rawadis, and rejects Ablheija being Kurd. "Ibn 'Amīd and Ibn Maskowieh have made a mistake that they considered Abūlahī Ja-ya as Kurd" Although he admits that Kurds have always been numerous in Azerbaijan, they were not dominant in Rawadian period" (*ibid*: 102). Other historians like Maklir, Made-lung, Minorski, Zarinkoub, Ibn Asir, Ibn Khalkan and ... ordained Rawadians to be Kurds. Kasravi himself narrates that historians other than Ibn Aetr did not consider the history of this group (Rawadians). Ibn Atir also regarded Rawadians and Abul heija as Kurd (Ibn-e Asir, the events of the years 420, cited in Kasravi, *ibid*: 168) Thus, Kasrawi's claim that Rawadians were Arabs are among the same mistakes, that is tracing their decent back to Arabs, that many Kurds and Iranians committed... just because of cultural/political hegemony of Arabs.

Another reason why there are doubts on the kurdishness of Rawdadis and other dynasties and the people of the region is that, as Kasravi himself pointed out, the ancient Persians and Islamic historians narrated only the history of the kings (Kasravi, *ibid*: 10) and narrating Kurds who have not occupied other countries and have not built an empire and have not had much effect on the history of the Middle East have not been so appealing to historians (Zarnoff, the introduction to SherafName). Because of this, only two historians stated such events. Khalifah Aydibek, one of the writers of Sufiyeh and the other, Monajimbashi, one of the en-tourages of Sultan Salim, in the Book of Saha'if al-Akhbar (Kasravi, *ibid*: 12). Monajim al-Bashi also narrated from the original version of Bob Alabwab that the original work of Bob al-Abwab has disappeared (Minorsky, 2008: 5). The author of Bob Abbas who, according to Monajim Bashi, died in the 500s, hated the Georgians and the invading Turks (Minorsky, *ibid*: 5). Unfortunately, the original book of Bob Abbas, whose author hated the Turks and Georgians and is likely to be a Kurd, has not been found and surely Monajim Albashi, a Turk has quoted from this book based on his own desire as he was in the court of Sultan Salim who tried to attract and subdue Kurds clans. In support of this statement, we can compare the Turkish text of this work, published as Sahif al-Akhbar in Istanbul, with the original text. The Turkish translation is just an upshot of the text, along with the removal of many important points of the Arabic original text (Minorsky, 1958, in trans by Khadem, 1387/2008: 3). Three chapters of Mosaferyan, Rawadians and Shadadians containing 21 pages and 651 lines in the original version involves

only 31 lines and Rawadian have been completely eliminated ... Shirvin and Darband parts in Bob al Abvab which concerns us, in version A, contains 25 pages and 755 lines, while it is only 83 lines in the Turkish translation (Minorsky, *ibid*: 4-5). Its Turkish translation was published in 1285-1868 AH in which the chapter related to Rawadian was completely eliminated and the rest was abridged and manipulated, because it was related to the Kurds; thus, the elimination of the history of Azerbaijan was a deliberate act. This manipulation of the original text occurred in 1868, when the Ottoman Empire was still under the flag of Islam and it tried to split the heart of the infidels with the sword of Islam with Turk, Arab and Kurd soldiers, and then there was still neither news of modern nationalism, nor the young Turks' movement, but in the translation of the book, Monajim Bashi into Turkish, the part that is related to the Kurds has been completely eliminated, abridged and vandalized <sup>70</sup>.

Abu al-Heija (a Kurd) defeated Abu Dolf Shibani in the areas of Darwibi and Nakhchivan and annexed the territories of Sporgans to the Aran tribes in the 378 AH (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 317). After Abu Allah, his son, Mamlan, took his father's place and his reputation was mostly due to the sacred wars that he had with the rulers of Nasrani, Georgian, Armenian, and even Byzantine armies. His son and his successor, Abu Mansour Wahsudan, became the ruler in 410 AH (*ibid*., 318). Since 369, when Ibn Masakui finished his history book and up to the time when Ibn Asir named Wahsudan for the first time, the history of Azerbaijan is quite dark. Due to the fact that the Wahsudan is a Dailami name, historians have erroneously considered both Wahsudan and Mamlan as Dailami, and they considered them as the survival of the Salarian family (Kasravi, *ibid*: 116). Zarinkoub also knows Rawadians, Wahsudans, and Mumalans as their Kurdish leaders and he considers Dailami names of Rowdians as the result of their racial blend (*ibid*: 317). He distinguished between Abu Mansour Wahsudan, son of Mamalan and the nephew of Kurdish Abualhyja that tried to evict the Ghz and Turk attackers with the help of his Kurd relatives in Azerbaijan (Zarrinkob, *ibid*: 322).

"Simultaneously with Wahsudan's ruling, the tribes of Ghaz following the unhappiness of Sultan Mahmud Ghaznavi attacked Jibal provinces and Asfehan from around Khorasan and came to the border of Azerbaijan. Wahsudan - Kurd Rawadi - Ghaderi, first hoped in their existence in those areas to repel his enemies. ... But their rebellions caused as the result of desertic and rustic manner made the province so insecure that Wahsudan in Tabriz and Maragheh sought to expel them in 430 AH. With the help of Kurdish relatives and with reliance on the people's hatred towards them, Wahsudan succeeded in expelling them via hardship and trickery" (Zarinkoub, *ibid*: 318) <sup>71</sup>. with the arrival of Tugril Baig Seljukhi in Azerbaijan in 446, but the independence of the Rabbi But Wahsudan obeyed Tugrul in friendship and statement, and his Emirate in Azerbaijan - which at that time included Eran, and Gheri - was also left to him. A few years later, his son Abu Sassar Mamalan ibn Washudan Kurdish was ruled by Tugril He took the place of the father - 450 hectares The Kurds did not lose sight of their local power by telling them about the Seljuqs, but only with the dismissal of them by "Lāb Arsalan 1071/465 -", the Salat al-Awadān in Azerbaijan was expelled from the scene of history. However, a branch of these evils In the name of Sidadian in the province of Aran, he remained in power. Since then, in the events of Azerbaijan, he has never had a significant independent role, and the family of the Ahmadilan of Maragheh, who, the Kurdish Rawadian belonged to, only became well-known long time later. Fat" (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 319) al-Asir, Abu Mansur Shah Zrbaygan Kurdish Rvady Hsvdanv son Mmlan to read and Aran (Ibn al-Asir, events of the years 420, cited in

Kasravi: 153). Mamlan has had wars with the Romans. Therefore, Qatran praised Mamlan and Abu Hassan Sheddadi:

One gets several times more than what mamlan had, and one gets as much as Fazlon had.

Qatran, who was the poet of their court, considered Mamlan's origion to be non-Arab, "because I am descended from Ajam ..." But Kasravi considers the Ajami origion of Mamlan as incorrect and he was sure he has been Arab (Kasravi, *ibid*: 155) <sup>72</sup>. When Ghazan came to Azerbaijan - as Ibn-e-Asir says - Amir - Kurdish Amir Wahsodan was the king of Azerbaigan. Ghazan looted Azerbaiganm in 429, they attacked Maragha and killed a large number of Hazbani Kurd and they did so in Kurdistan and Armanistan (Ibn Asirs, events of 420s, cited in Kasrav: 168). After their defeat in 430 AH, they went to Mousel and they fought against Kurds and killed many Kurds and took control of their women and property and dispatched Kurds to the mountains "(Ibn al-Asir, cited in Kasravi: 170). Ghazans also killed many in Diyarbakir, Mosul and the Jizira (Kurduen-Qaderi) ... after their defeat ffrom the Kurds of Mosul, they returned to Azerbaigan" (Ibn Asir, the events of the years 420).

After the domination of the Seljukites and the decline of the Rawdis, the name of a native ruler called Ahmadiyalān was mentioned for the first time in 501 AH. Ibn 'As'ir states the name of Amir Ahmadil, who is the ancestor of Ahmadilian, he calls him the Lord of Maragheh. Ibn Asir knows Ahmadil, son of Abraham, son of Wushudan i.e. Kurdish Rawadi as one of the survivors of the Rawadis (Ibn Asir, the events of the years 510). Ahmedil was killed by the Fadaiyan in 510 (Ibn Asir, *ibid*). Aladdin Kirpa Arsalan was one of the most famous rulers of his time and descendant of Ahmadilyan whom Nizami Ganjawi wrote his BahramNameh in his name (Kasravi, *ibid*: 206). Rawandi, who were at the same time as Aladdin, has praised his judgement and he has considered him as the Lord of Maragheh (Kasravi, *ibid*: 208). After finishing BahranName in 594 AH, he sent it to Roeeen Dezh for Ala al-Din <sup>73</sup>.

Not because of hunger, indebted I am      Dej (fortress) is Roein (strong) even without Deram Zarin (golden) Nail which is the center of the earth    His Roein Dej's (strong fortress) name is because of his strength

(Bahram Nama-ye Ganjavi)

The Ahmadyals, who were the remnants of the Rawadi, survived until the Mongol invasion in the first half of the 7th century near Maragheh (Ra'isNia, 1380: 46). According to Ibn Asir, the last rulers of Ahmadiālīnī in Roin-e-Djez - was the 618 at the hands of the Mongols (Kasravi, *ibid*: 213) <sup>74</sup>. According to Ibn Athir, the Lord of Maraghe was a woman in RoinDej (*ibid*). The advance of the Turks in Maragheh in 1029 destroyed a large number of Kurds from Hazbani tribe. Furthermore, many of the Kurds from Abualhyja'ra territory were killed in Urmia. (Lazarov, 1930, translated into Kurdish by Sangawi, 2101: 74). Mongols in Syria and Azerbaijan killed whosoever Kurds they encountered. The invasion of Turks was following the Seljuq's assault on the Kurds' lands. In 1101 BC, the Seljukites killed nearly 2,000 Kurds (*ibid*: 76).

Kurd being of Shadadian

With the arrival of Tugril Baig, the independence of the Rawadis and with assault of "AlbArsalan-1071/465" - "the Rawadis in general disappeared from the scene of history in Azerbaijan. However, a branch of these Kurds called Shadadiyan still remained in power (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 319). Based on Arab and Armenian historians: "Muhammad bin Shadhad was the leader of Hazbaniyah tribesmen and Rawadi Kurds whose tribal people were living in Aran province and the districts of Baku, Ganjah, Darband and Barde'a" (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 320). Sadiyan were from Hazbani Kurds (Kasravi, *ibid*: 219) and Hazbania were from Kharijites (Massoudi, cited in Kasravi, *ibid*: 559). Shadadyan were Kurds and their location was Ardebil and Ganje, their ruling lasted from 340 to 468 AD, for 128 years. (Minorsky, 1953, in trans by Khadem, 1387/2008:11).

Sadiadans are divided into two groups: "A group has ruled in Aran, and another one in Ani and Armenia, among the historians only MonajimBashi has written the name of Aran Shadad-ian" (Kasravi, *ibid*: 219). Kasravi writes that Ibn Asir has considered Kurdish Fazlon- Shedadi – as the ruler of a piece of Azerbaijan (Ibn Asir, the events of the year 421, cited in Kasravi, *ibid*), and he has not recognized the race and descent of Fazlon, and he has not known that he was the ruler of all Arans and a large part of Armenia (Kasravi, *ibid*: 220). This word of Kasravi is not accurate since Ibn Asir has introduced Arran as a part of Azerbaijan in the chapter on stating wars (Ghazve) of Fazlon Kurdi (Ra'isNijah, *ibid*: 80). Shadadian controlled Aran until the Seljuk period, and their survivors ruled over Ani in Armenia for more than a hundred years (Kasravi, *ibid*: 225).

The sons of Muhammad bin Shadad, Abolhassan Ali Lashkari and Marzban ibn Muhammad regained the estates of Ibn Shadad in Eran and obtained it from the Salaris. – 360 AH - Shadadian domination on Ganjeh was done by another one of their brothers, Fazlon ibn Mohammad, with the support of Kurds in the region. With the occupation of Aran, he ruled for 48 years and did constructions and built the bridges over the Aras ... After him, the time of his descendant, the second Lashkari - Abu al-Hassan al-Ali – was coincided with the invasion of Ghaz Turkmen to Azerbaijan and Eran "(Zarrinbub, *ibid*: 321-332). This family dominated not only all over Aran, but also ruled on Dowin of Armenia. Monajim al Bashi writes: "The people were very pleased with him, (Kasravi, *ibid*: 234). Shadadiyan gripped Sharvans from the hands of MosaferyanIn 395 AH and ruled over Arran - the border between the Khor and the Aras"(Minorsky, *ibid*: 145). Bardea have been attracted to the power realm of Shadadiyan most of the time and in1063/455 Abu'l-Asvar Ganjai attacked Shirwan three times and the local Kurds welcomed him warmly. In 1065/457 Masqat Kurds were threatened and the name of Fazl ibn Sayar was read in Prayer sermons in Bab in 461 (Minorsky, *ibid*: 146). In 458, Sherwan and its inhabitants were still Kurds.

In this year, 458 and ... -Turks broke into Sheravan and plundered the Kurds' houses (Monajemal Bashi, cited in Bob Al-Boubab and in Minorsky, 1958, in trans by Khadem, 1987/2008: 63). With the prevalence of Tugrul and Alb Arsalan, the local independence of this clan ended in 446 AH, Ibn Asir writes: "Sultan Malkshahh too took towns from Fazlon and gave it to the guardian of Sarhang Savakin Khadim. Fazlon returned to his land, became powerful and then rioted. Sultan sent Amir Bozan to fight with him, arrested him and gave his land to others. Fzlun died in poverty in a mosque next to the Tigris River in Baghdad in 484 (Ibn Athir, cited in Kasravi, *ibid*: 258). The name of this Kurdish dynasty was deleted in history till Salahuddin became famous (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 332).

Beides, the historians have known the lords of Oromid, Sadgha ibn Ali ibn Sadgha, who, according to Blazari, became disobedient and rebellion at the time of Haron Rashid as kurds (Kasravi, the same, 139). "Ma'moun sent Zerigha, Sedigeha's sibling to fight Khurdamín, Sedigheh did not go ... Then, Zariqa dispatched to Mosul. Ma'mun irritated. He selected Mohammad bin Hamid Tusi as the provincial governor of Azerbaigan and sent him to fight Zeriqa, he arrested him and sent him to Baghdad, after which there was no news about him" (Kasravi, *ibid*: 140).

Thus, the land of Minor Mede has always belonged to Kurd from the 3rd century BC to the 5th century AH coinciding with the invasion of the Turks / Mongols. With the arrival of the uninvited guests of the Aqos, Turks, Mughals, Quiquunlu, Qaraqunlu, and Turkmen Qizilbashi Turkmen, the demographic / linguistic structure of that region turned from Kurdish to Turkish and Azeri. After the Seljuks, Mughals and Timurid invaders, who challenged the population and the language of Kurds, it was the turn of other Turkish tribes. "The two Turkish tribes of Qarqvinlu and Akhavinlu migrated from Turkestan to Azerbaijan in the late 13th century. Aghquynlou settled in the districts of Diyarbakir and Qevinlo in Erzincan" (Hinz, 1936, in trans by Jahandari, 1361/1982: 32). Ozon Hassan had some skirmishes with Kurdish rulers in the east and after victory over the Qara Qawinlu in 1467, he made Kurdish tribesmen obeying (Hinz, *ibid*:s 57). Alexander, the son of Qarayosuf, raided in Kurdistan and Azerbaijan after defeating Shahrokh in 1421 BC, and he had great political successes in Kurdistan. In 830/1427, he defeated Sultan Ah-mad, the Prince of Kurd (Savory, 1925, in trans by Azizi, 1382/2003: 36). "After the demise of the Quinvals, the Kurds temporarily regained their independence until they were once again suppressed by the Shah Isma'il with the help of the Turkmens of both tribes of Aq'quawllu and Qaraqawinlu were suppressed "(Hinz, *ibid*: 57). Safavids followed Auzun Hassan's policy in dealing with Kurds who put Gizzalashan in place of the Kurdish rulers (Lazarov, *ibid*: 143). Shah Isma'il also proceeded to carry out a series of military campaigns in 911 AH after strengthening its position in central Iran seeking security along the western borders with Kurdistan and Diyar-bakir and he dipilidated the army of Erdowishir "Sarem Kurd", he followed Shir Sarom and there occurred a hard fighting with the Kurds and a lot was killed from both sides; finally, Shir Sarem's son and his brother were captured and murdered (Savory, *ibid*: 84). Safavid were following Kurdish killing policy and killed three great Amirs (commanders) and 400 people of Dhumbah Layan in one day under the command of Shah Tahmasb (Lazarov, *ibid*: 144).

Shah Ismail jailed 11 Kurdish Amirs (commanders) (Lazarov, *ibid*: 131). "Shah Abbas launched a slaughterhouse of blood in mokeryan after obtaining Damdam castle ... they killed everyone who was at their hands and did not have anymercy on any Kurd "(*ibid*: 151). Shah Isma'il tried three times to make Jizira and Emir of Bhutan his own tributary or taxpayer, but it was in vain. Ismail repeatedly sent his troops to eradicate Mukrians and removing its people, but they did not succeed (Lazarov, *ibid*: 155). largest movement of that century lead-ing by Mir Suleiman-Bah Bah ..." was against Turkey and Iran - the 17th century, but In 1699, Ghezelbashan defeated them--- ... After defeating Mir of Babaan, the commander of the Iranian soldiers commanded to kill all the inhabitants of Kurdistan-e Ardalan ... made a minaret of bones ... because the rulers of Ardalan were with" Suleiman" (Muhammad Sharif Qachi, the historian of Ardalan, cited in Lazarov, *ibid*:158). In the 17th century, there were alot of hostilities between kurds and Fars ... The Belba tribe, who were not obedient, also rebelled in Azerbaijan. In 1715, Kurds revolted in Iran ... In 1744, the Dombul tribe re-volted in Salmas

... the Azerbaijanis backed them ... that this riot was ruthlessly repressed at Nader's time ... Abdul Rahman Baban who rebelled at the time of Mohammad Khan-e Qajar ... said that he liked to liberate Kurdistan from under the Turkish and Iranian domination "(Lazarov, *ibid*: 159). During the reign of Shah Abbas, the rebel of Qal'eh-e Dam Dam by Amir Khan Bradost was crushed and all were Massacred after nearly a year of siege and war (Zeki, *ibid*: 142). Both Ottomans and Safavids also displaced kurds; Shah Abbas transferred about 15 thousand Kurds to Khorasan in 1612... Nadir Shah also transferred them from Khorasan to Mashhad "(Lazarov, *ibid*: 150). Thus, the invasion of the Oghozes was a never-ending event of Turks migration into the land of minor Mad, Azerbaijan (and Kurdistan) and it was also the beginning of the end of the Kurdish existence in that territory, which does not mean that the Kurds would make a claim about the present-day inhabited homeland of Turks. By the way, the residents of that place are now Turks and it is the land of the turks. However, We intended to provide evidences that the history of that land is a part of the his-tory of Kurds and ... before the invasion of Turks in 11th century BC.

### The General Name of Kurdistan

During the caliphate, Kurdistan and its borders were the same as those during the Sassanid empire, which included jizira, the northern Mesopotamia, Azerbaijan, Iraqi Arabia and Hamadan ... (Lazarov, *ibid*: 52). The name of Kurdistan was first introduced by Sultan Sanjar in the 12th century that the capital of which was Bahar city in Hamedan and it included Azerbaijan, Lorestan, Hamedan, Dinor, Kermanshah, Seneh (Sanandaj), East Zagros and Shahrzur (Lazarov, *ibid*: 49). However, the name of Kurdistan was first used in a Geographical book, that is, in the book of Nizheto al-Gholob of Hamdaullah Mostofi in 8 A, and it included: Arman provinces, Jizira, Erbil (Howler) and Amed the center of which was bahar town in northern Hamadan, and he knows the cities of Taq Bostan, Bisotun, Mahidasht, Darband, Taj Khatun, Khafatyan, Bahar, Dinor, Shahrzur, Kermanshah, Kangavar, Darband Zangi and Alshatr city as parts or subordinates of it (Mostofi, cited in Tabari: 26). Therefore, Azerbai-jan - Arran was also a part of it - and a part of Kurdistan and the majority of its inhabitants were counted as Kurds up to the 5th century and one or two centuries after Mostofi com-posed his book. It is clear that the areas that were Iranian, Turks or Arabs would not become famous under the name of Kurdistan – that was an inferiorating title at that time. Lazarof also adimitted the name of Kurdistan as referring to the Kurds residents of the regions where was defined as Kurdistan at the time of Mostawfi and wrote that “Arab writers termed Kurdistan as where the Kurds are located” (Lazarov, *ibid*: 51). Certainly, as Lazarov also pointed out, Arab writers have defined the lands as Kurdistan where the majority of its inhabitants and the language used there was Kurdish. Thus, Azerbaijan / Minor Mede and Aran, which was the cradle of Khurdamini's rebellion, were the Kurdish land. Azerbaijan, as it has always been part of the Mede in the ancient period, has been part of the Jibal land in Islamic era as well. Jibal consists of a vast area of the ancient Median land and it has replaced the name of the western Media (Reza, 1390/2011: 160). In the period of Mamoun, a governor has been in charge of the Azerbaijani government and Jabal-Media - (Reza, *ibid*: 161). Isfahani writes: "Mamoun had appointed Abdullah bin Taher to fight with Babak and Azerbaijan and Jabal warriors" (Isfahani, in trans by Sho'ar, 1367/1988: 207).



The Kurds, like the Sassanids and Achaemenids period,<sup>75</sup> have also embarked on numerous insurrections during the Islamic era and have never given way to the "symbolic order" of the Arabs / Islam, Turks, and Iran domination as "the real issue". The Kurds cooperated with all the insurgencies that were the enemy of the central Caliphate power, and the Caliphate power was superficial in the Kurdish regions (Lazarov, *ibid*: 68). Ibn Hoqoul regarded Chewarzar and the inhabitants of Shahrzur as Kurd. Yaghot Hamawi describes the residents of Shahrzur as the insurgents and rioters. Arabs applied a lot of violence in Shahrzur. The inhabitants of Shahrzur were not subordinate to the caliph, and the caliph never managed to dominate them. Yakubi named the two most important Kurdish cities of the time of Omar as Ghermasin and Halvan. Halvan and Seneh-Sisehr - were not submissive to Khalf like Shahrzur, and were always insurgents. Kurdish cities like Dinawar and Halwan, and "Sohraward" and "Shahrzur" were later destroyed due to their numerous rebellions against the caliphate. Mosul, which according to Ibn Hoqoul, most of its inhabitants were Kurds, was one of the centers of the Kurdish rebellion against the caliphate system. The Mosul rebellion led by Ja'far Ibn-e Fahrjis in 902, the Shahrzur rebellion led by Abi Rabi-e Kurdi, the next Mosul rebellion led by Muhammad Bilal-e Kurdi, Revolt of Isfahan led by Abdullah, the son of Ebrahim-e Kurdi and ... all insurrections from Jizira and Mosul to Isfahan and Hamedan and Shahrzur against the caliphate-whether the Umayyads or Abbasid-were in the hands of the Kurds. The Khawarij rebellion was in 886 in Mosul and Helwan. The Kurds also participated in the Khawrijites uprising in 700-701. Ibn-e Asir considered Kurd's Yaghobi tribe as the alliance of Khawarijis riots. The Kurds also contributed to the rebellion of "Zingiyakan" in Khuzestan in 869 BC. The Khuzestan Kurds provinces under the leadership of Muhammad, son of Hazar-e Kurds participated in this rebellion. In 10th century, the Kurdish ruler in the Syrian area called Ja'far, the son of Hamidi-e Kurd cooperated with the rebellion of Gharamete in Iraq and Syria. The Kurds never bended their knees for any power, and they always defended their race though they never became the owners of their own government, but did not obey anyone, too. (Lazarov, *ibid*: 53 to 77).

#### Abu Muslim and Khoramdinan

But the most important Kurdish rebellion, against the Arab / Islamic caliphate and Iranian feudalism, was the Khoram-Dinan rebellion. Khorramdinyan's rebellion may have been the last Kurdish/Mithraism riot against the metaphysical doctrine and the Iranian imposed class structure which has not yet given way to the logic of Iranian thought. After the revolt of Kharvdinan, mysticism prevails in Kurdistan, where the transition from Karamudi's action, from the tragedy of action to silence and surrender to mysticism has not yet been investigated. Many historians and even the Khuridinids themselves, paid tribute to the Mazdakis as well as to Abu Moslem, before them, a brief mention of Abu Musalm would be necessary. It should be recalled that we are just trying to prove the Khoramdinan and Abu Muslim being Kurd in this chapter, and we will postpone any philosophical analysis to the following chapters. If, in the previous materials, we prolonged our discussion about the minor Mede (Azer-baijan) in spite of my heartfelt desire, it was only to prove that the areas under the influence of Khurdamini at that time were Kurd-inhabited areas. The revolt of Khurdamini has a significant importance from the viewpoint of Kurdish history and the conceptualization of Kurdish

political thought which, unfortunately, Kurdish historians have not understood its importance yet.

#### Kurd being of Abu Muslim

Abu Muslim was born in "Mah of Basra" (Haghighat (Rafi'e):135). Some also consider him as from Isfahan (Isfahani, cited in Seddiqi, 1372/1993: 62) As we wrote earlier, Mah of Basra was part of the old Media that was later named as Kurdistan. It was most likely that Abu Muslim was from the Kurds of Isfahan. AbuDelame, the poet in the court of caliph and the contemporary of Abu Muslim, considered him as Abu Mujram (son of evil) and his fathers as Kurd (Yusefi, 1987/2008: 30) <sup>76</sup>. Moghaddasi, Ibn Khalkan and the author of Sistan's history also have called him as Abu Muslim-e "Kurd" (Seddiqi, *ibid*: 62).

Although, the Kurds lived in Khorassan <sup>77</sup> before the Safavid period, the following issues all indicate the existence of Kurds in Khorasan: Kurd being of Abu Muslim Khorasani, memoirs of Da'bal-e Khazae on his way to Merv and his encounter with the Alawite Kurds, the memoirs of Timur in the book of "I am Timur-e Jahanghosha ( the world conqueror), who on the path to Quchan, ran into group who said we are Kurds, and at the time of Tamerlane, Clavijo's (the Spaish mbassay to TamerLane) reference to the existence of Kurds in Khorasan (Ranjbar, 1381/2002: 8). Eventhough, we have no claim and document about Kurd being of Abu Muslims followers, it is not unlikely that the masses of the people in that region were still Kurd at that time, especially due to this fact that the other riots have occurred against Iranism in the same areas.

What is obvious is that the pretext for the blood of Abu Musalm was a spark that aroused the fire of dissatisfaction with the Arab caliphate, the peasants and the aristocrates who supported the Umayyads (Amoretti, 425: 1cited in Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 425) Abu Moslem was the greatest enemy of the peasants (Amoretti, *ibid*). Iranians fought Abu Musalem in favor of the Umayyad (Yusufi, 163: 1378). Abu Moslem's agreement with the murder of Abu Salmah Khalal (a proponent of Al-e Ali) and his intense struggle with the Shiites of Bukhara denies his struggle for the sake of Shi'a (Yousefi, *ibid*: 164). He also killed "Beh Afrin" who had the Zoroastrian religion and had presented a book in Farsi (Yusufi, *ibid*: 158), so he did not uprising in favour of Iranism. The main carriers of Iranian culture and traditions were peasants during the Sassanid era. Most of the poets, including the great Ferdowsi and Samanids were from the peasants of Khorasan. Indeed, everything that is interpreted Iranian culture in the Islamic period was re-lated to the peasants. However, Abu Moslem was the greatest enemy of the peasants. Maz-dakies left their secret life with the advent of Abu Moslem during the extinction of the Umayyads for the first time, (Klima, 1957, in trans by Fekri Ershad, 1371/1992: 59). When the news of the murder of Abu Mus-lims came to Khorasan and the Jabal areas, the Khormedians ... They- Moslemia- proclaimed that they followed Imamate of Abu Muslim. They disagreed after his death ... Some said that Abu Musalm had not died, and he would not die, and he will reemerge and make the earth full of justice ... and the other section considered his death as a reality and they believed in the Imamate of his daughter Fatemah; hence, they were called Fatemia. Now in the year of 332, most of Khorramians are from the Kurdkia and Ludshahdia sections, which are more reliable than all Khorramis, Babak Khorramdin, who revolted against Mammon and Muetasam from Eran nd Azerbaijan, was one

of them. Most khorramian are in Khorasan, Rey, Isfahan, Azerbaijan, Karaj, Borj, Siravan, Simeereh, Erioujan, and Mosbazan, and they are settled more in farms and villages ... "(Masoudi, in trans by Payande, 1370/1991: 297). Many of the subsequent move-ments happened in revenge of Abu Moslem's bloodcame. "Sanbād" whose moto was the de-struction of the Ka'bah gathered a large number of the farmers of Jabal (Motehede, cited in Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 59). Eshpuler also writes that the followers of Sanbad were the inhabitants of the moun-tains. The are the middle of Tabarestan where was the area of activity of "BehAfrid" in the past turned into the activity zone of Sanbad (Spuller, cited in Frye, *ibid*: 428). Therefore, we can truely risk presenting this hypothesis that the masses of people still were Mede /Kurd at that time since Iranians were superior ethnic group/ class during their arrival from the steppes of southern Russia, but the masses of the old people of Mede were still present there. Although, other movements such as that of Sanbad began in eastern Iran, most of its followers were peasents of Jibal-e Mad (Kurdistan) and were in connection with Jabal.

#### Kurd being of Babak and Khoramdinan:

Tabri says that Babak was from the clan of Mazdak (Tabari, cited in Nafisi, *ibid*: 8). Apparently, Babak was busy in Nahvand, then he went to Tabriz, and at the age of 18, he went to his mother in "Baz"( Haghghat (Rafie), *ibid*: 281). " Ibn-e al-Nadim, (n.d ) in Al-Fihrest says:" His father was a man from the peo-ple of Madain andhe was an oil seller, he went to the borders of Azerbaijan and settled in a place called Bilal Abad in the village of Miyamad ... he fell in lve with a woman who was Ba-bak's mother ... Babak served Shabil bin Manghi Azdi in a place on the top of a mountain and he was the shipherd of his cattle He learned trampling from the servents, then he went to Ta-briz in Azerbaijan and he was with Mohammad ibn Rawadi for two years, then he returned to his mother and stayed with her "(ibn-e al-Nadim (n.d), in trans by Tajadod, 1368/1989: 614). Abu Hanifa Dinouri writes in Akhbar- Al-Tawal: people disagreed about Babak's descent and religion, and what came to me to be true and was proved to me is that he was one of the sons of Mozafar ibn Fatima, the daughter of Abu Muslim, and the clan of Fatemiyeh are connected to him from the Khoramīyah" (Dinavari, in Nafisi, *ibid*: 12). Samani has written the father of Babak as Mardas (Samaani in Zarinkoub, *ibid*: 216). Mardas has derived from two parts, "mard=man" and "as=eater", meaning maneater, and the father Zahak was also called Mardas. (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 216). Of course, this title was molded on him from behalf of the others.

What can be inferred from the narations was that Babak was born in ageographical / historical situation, which was part of the land of Med and Jabal, where was later called Kurdistan. If Tabari's narration is true, we have stated Kurd being of Mazdakis and if Dinawari's state-ment is well-versed, Abu Muslim's Kurd being may be right. Babak was initially living in Nahawand (the Mah of Al-Basa) in the land of Mad, then he went to the Minor Mad. Perhaps, Kurd being of Babak can not be proven, but he can not be considered as Turk, Arab or Iranian in any way. Turks and Arabs did not exist in masses in Azerbaijan and Aras at that time. There had been no mention of Turk or Arab being of either Babak himself nor his followers in any narrative. Babak's not being Iranian is also evident because he did not know Persian (Ibn al-Adim, *ibid*: 613, Spuler, 1952a, in trans by Falatori, 1377/1998: 344). Most important of all was that Babak's movement was as much anti-Arabic / Islamic as it was anti-Iranian / Zoroastrian. Iranians did not hesitate to cooperate with Arabic caliphs to suppress him (Zarrinkob,

1384/2005: 221). This movement was suppressed by Iranian Afshin and his army, Turkic slaves, and the legitimacy on the part of the caliph. Babak's language had been something between Kurdish and Taleshi. More importantly, Babak became acquainted with Tabriz and Baz, where later became the patron of his revolutionary force via one of the boys of Mohammed bin Rawad- Kurd -. (Ibn al-Dinim, *ibid*: 406. Zarinkob, *ibid*: 234). Babak, was acquainted with the Kurds of Rawadi and Baz, that is to say, he was not from Baz in origin, but he was from Nahavand, and the Jibal (the mountains) of Meded and has had a common plan and race with the Kurds of Rawadi. As we have pointed out in the section on Mazdak uprising, my work is not creating heroism, the heroes are the mass of people. The Khoramddinan uprising had also existed before Babak. Thus, Babak's race and language are not so much important; what is important are the follow-ers of

#### Babak and Khoramddinan Human Geographys:

Ibn Nadim writes in the book of *Al-Furthur* that: "The Khoramīyah is categorized into two parts... one group that is called Mohamra in Azerbaijan, Dinor, Hamedan and Isfahan ... the other is a tribe called *Atfal o alLaghta* (the children of *Al-Kuttah* = found children) whose founder is Mazdak" (Ibn-e al-Dinim, *ibid*: 611). Massoudi writes in *Marwajo al-Zahab*: "Most of the Khorramians are from the *Kurdkia*" and "*Ludshahia*" sections, which are more reliable than all the Khorramians. Babak Khorramdin, who uprose against Mamoun and Mo'tashim in Eran and Azerbaijan, was one of them. Most of Khorramian were in Khorasan, Rey, Isfahan, Azerbaijan, Karaj, Borj, Siravan, and Simeereh, Erioujan, and Masbazan, and ... most are settled in farms and villages" (Maso'udi, *ibid*: 297). According to Ibn-Asir "A large crowd of people from Jabal, Hamedan, Isfahan, Masabad, etc., accepted the religion of Khorrami, and they gathered and built *Lashkar Gah* in Hamedan, and Moetasam sent an army on them, and Ishaq bin Ibrahim Musab was with that army, and he (Moetasam) appointed him to the mission in Jibal in Shawwal. And Isaac faced these people around Hamadan and killed sixty thousand of them." (Ibn Asir, the events of the years 210...). Zarinkob sees Babak's uprising in al-Badz in the mountainous regions of Aran and near Aras in 201 AH (Zarinkoub, *ibid*: 69). In continuing the same book, he considered the areas between Aras and Aran in the period of the Abbasids as Kurd." In the early Islamic centuries, the role of Kurds in a particular sense, not in the general sense, ... their dwellings have covered from Zagros to Azarbaijan, Arran and Darband (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 333). Ghulam-Hussein Seddiqi offers a more complete list of positions of Khoramddinan: "Masbazan, Mehrangkhadeh (in Iraq-e Ajam near Samareh, Helwan road to Hamadan), Isfahan and Borj, and warsanjan, Ko-dasht, a section of MehrganKade, land of Sirvan, Arojān as part of Masbazan and Hamadan, and the Mah of Kufa, The Mah of Basra, the village of Qamdan where the Kurds were living in it, the village of Fahman whose inhabitants were Kurds, Azerbaijan and Armenia, Rey and Khorasan, that most of them settled in villages ..." (Seddiqi, *ibid*: 258). Azerbaijan and Aras that were the same Minor Median land and they were later called as parts of Kurdistan. Mar-korat also has included Sirvan, Saimara, and Masbazan and ... as parts of the land of Medes (Markwart, 1901, in trans by MirAhmadi, 1373/1994: 44s). Tabari has introduced a large part of Jabal's inhabitants as Khoramddinan (Fakhouri, in trans by Ayati, 1381/2002: 163). Khwaja Nizam al-Mulk has also described the provinces of Jabal and Iraq-e Ajam where they were called Old Media (Frye, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 22) as the main center of Khoramddinan. Many of the places that there

introduced as the inhabitants of Khoramdinan have not initially been Khoramardini. Religious movements have been opposed to the scholastic ruling system that they have been labeled as Khoramardini to justify their suppression and removal of them". Nezam Al Molk considered most of the Shiites and Batnyans as Khorramardini (Nizam al-Mulk, cited in Nafisi, *ibid*:s 20) who were not in fact Khorramardini.

Therefore, the movements of Khorasan, Tabarestan, Fars, etc. can hardly be attributed to Khoramdinan. Khoramdinan were in the human geography of Kurdistan and not in other places. Many other riots outside Kurdistan were only political, not Ideological oppositions like the Kurdish Khoramdinan. For example, "There are no clear reasons why Maziar turned against the caliph. Maziar was the absolute follower of the caliph in the beginning, and his opposition was the result of being sacrificed between the two political men (Tahir and Af-shin), not any particular ideology "(Madelung, cited in Frye, *ibid*: 178). Further, one of the reasons for the failure of Maziar was that the Zoroastrians of Tabarestan have not accepted Mazdaki/Khoramardini tendencies, and the religion of the Khoramdinan was rejected by them like Muslims (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 242). It is also possible to attribute this writing of Madelung about the Maziar uprising to many revolting movements, in many places, uprisings of Kharijites, Shiites and ... have been introduced as Khorramardini, while they have nothing to do with the Khoramardini and their ideology. The reason behind their geographical dispersion is the same thing. While the Khoramdinans were in origin restricted to Azerbaijan and Jabal, we have no other documents on allegations - Sexual freedom and worldly pleasures - attributed to Babak's Khoramdinan, to other insurrections in Khorasan and Ahvaz and ... well-known as KhorramDinan. As Madelung said about Maziar, many of these movements were either purely political or interreligious and had nothing to do with the Mazdaki/Khoramardini ideology; hence, the ruling Caliphate system molded on them the charge of being Khoramdinism - which is very ugly with Muslims and they hated it - to justify the suppression of those religious / political movements. Like today that they consider any movement in the Middle East as agents of alQaeda and ....

Therefore, the main center of Khoramdinan has been the same northwest areas, Hamedan, Ashafan, Masbazan, Mehregan, Jabal, and Azerbaijan, which was later called Kurdistan. The Babak movement remained restricted to the mountainous inhabitants ... and it has not penetrated among the Arabs, Turks and Barmakids whom, according to Jahiz, were the backbones of Islam and its army. "(Fakhori, *ibid*: 169). It does not mean that all its inhabitants of somewhere like Isfahan, which was introduced as one of the main centers of Khoramardini, were Khoramardini, but parts of it such as Ghamdan were "Kurds" settled (Seddiqi, *ibid*: 258) were Khoramardini. Fotohol Boldan-e Balazori and Al-Baladan Yaghobi pointed out that the inhabitants of Isfahan were mixed together and their Arabs are few ..." one of the villages of Isfahan is Qammadan where Kurds are settled there, and Khoramdinan have emerged from this place, and the other is the village of Fahman, where the Khoramardini Kurds are residing "(Blazari and Ya'qubi quoted in the book of the background of people culture ...). Yagobi also points out that "in the region of Isfahan Kurds lived who had downgraded social life; thus, Khoramini revolted in Isfahan"(Yaghobi, cited in Frye, *ibid*: 435).

### Race and nationality of Khoramdinan:

Massoudi considers two important sectaries of Khorramdinan as Kudkia and KurdShahia (Mas'oudi vol2, ibid: 297). Kudkia has been likely to refer to the followers of the son of Fatima, the daughter of Abu Moslem who, according to Nizam al-Mulk, were called Kodak-e Dana (the wise child) (Nizam al-Molk, ibid: 204. Spuler, ibid: 370). The name of the other group is viewed as Kudshahia and Ludshahih, the correct form of which is Kurdshahia. As al-Tunbay and al-Ashraf also writes: The lands of Kurds' Jibal were vast and numerous and according to Yaghoubi some of its people were Khoramddin "(Seddiqi, ibid: 259). Probably this means the Shah (king) of Kurds. The other is known as Mohamereh (Tabari (vol3), ibid: 38) whom Khoramdinan were called under this name in Azerbaijan, Nahavand, Dinor and ... (Baghdadi, cited in Seddiqi, ibid: 265). Other sect of them were known as Khosravia which there is not accurate knowledge about it; only we know that one of the Kurdish tribes in Fars was called Khosraviyeh" (Seddiqi, ibid: 265). Apparently, the Kurds played a major role in all movements of Khorramdini. Abu Ja'far Ahmad bin al-Hussein Ahwazi converted a group of Jibal and Kohe-Baz Kurds, who were Khorramdini, to their religion (Qarmati) (Massion, cited in Seddiqi, idib: 321). Based on Nizam al-Molk Khoramdinan rebelled in Isfahan ... at the time of the caliphate of Wasiq (227-223) and afterwards. After committing a great deal of evil and corruption, they were finally caught up ... and they captured and killed them, and heads were moved around in Isfahan; thus, the whole of Islam cheered up and they wrote congratulation letters to each other. "(Nizam al-Mulk, cited in Seddiqi: 322). Sid-diqi further noted that the changes that Tabarī pointed to during the caliphate of Wasiq" this year, Wasif-e Turk came to Iraq from the area of Isfahan and Jabal and Fars, and he went to repel Kurds that had taken these areas and chained five hundred Kurds including children, and they brought them to Iraq and imprisoned them. "(Tabari vol3, c beyonited in Seddiqi, ibid: 322), it is highly probable that this was the same Kurds' insurgency that Nizam al-Mulk referred to it and these Kurds were Khoradiman (Seddiqi, ibid: 322-323). Therefore, it is evident based on the sources that not only the land of the Khoramdinan uprising were the settlement of Kurds, but the majority of Khoramdinan and their uprisings have been made up by the Kurds.

Many historians believe <sup>78</sup> Khoramdinans are the continuation of Mazdakyan movement and many <sup>79</sup> know it as the continuation of Abu Muslim, that in either case we proved the existence of the Kurd being of Mazdakites as well as Abu Muslims. Babak's movement in Azerbaijan and Jabal preserved the continuation of the resistance of the Mazdak followers during the Sassanid era in these areas. It reconciled Babak, Abu Moslem and Mazdak with each other. "Khorram-Dinans were the remnants of Mazdakis who secretly preached Mazdak's teachings from the very beginning of the fall of the Sasanians in Azerbaijan" (Zarinkob, 138/2005: 68). Some historians <sup>80</sup> correctly, based on the contract referred to in the book of Blazori <sup>81</sup> between the Azerbaijani border guard and Khalifa Omar, the consider the main body of the Azerbaijani Army as Kurds during Arabs assault Arabs that converted to the Khoramdinan religion. Marquaret emphasizes that Kurds were largely inhabited in Sabalan, and since they were Eilatis (tribes) and nomads, they had rioting spirits. Because of this, the communist fantasies of Babak were well recieved among the Kurds; thus, these people were neither pure Zoroastrian nor Muslims (Markwart, cited in Ra'isNia, 1358/1979: 126). Therefore, "the Khoramdinan rsevolt which was founded based on the foundations of of the Meshdakism were formed in connection with the Kurds.

Babak, the leader of the Khorramdinyan uprising in the year-837-816 ... had an agreement with the tribe of Yaqubi Kurd to help and cooperate with him ... Ismat-e Kurdi, the ruler of the city of Marand was one of the co-workers (the chief commander or the deputy, Qaderi) of the Khoramandin and he sacrificed his life for the sake of Khoramandin rebellion (Lazarov, 1930, in *Kurdish Trans* by Sangavi, 2010: 67). Apparently, Rawadian-e Kurd has also collaborated with Khordaminians and, as the result, they suffered a lot. During the victory of al-Sajah, Baz castle were de-stroyed and Tabriz went out from under the supervision of Rawa'dians "(Zarinkob, 1384/2005: 316). Thus, during Babak-e Khoramdin uprising, Tabriz and Baz were in the hands of Rawa'dians. One of the signs of Rawa'dian-e Kurd cooperation with Babak was that they also lost their power after the suppression of the Babak movement and destruction of Baz and there is no name of them until the next one or two centuries. Most of the members of Khoram-Dinan-e Babak were Kurd Rawa'dians. In fact, Babak succeeded to yprise with the help of Rawa'dian-Kurd, Ismat-e Kurdi, the ruler of Marand, and Yaqubi Kurdish tribe.

Musa Khorni, the Armenian historian who is famous as Herodotus of Armenia, relates the founding of Armenia to Tigrana, the king of Armenia, and writes that Tigrana, united with Cyrus, ousted Ajydak, king of Maran (the Medes) and freed Armenia. But the most important point among his Khorni's statement is his indirect reference to the Kurd being of the Kharrodynians, the villages of Khorram ... and most importantly, he considered Kurds to be of the Ajydahk generation. Musa Kharani lived in the 9th century, i.e 3 AH. Khorni writes that Tigrana, the king of Armenia, moved the Armenian Mars -Armenians called the Medes as Mars – to three small town of Kheram- Khoram, Jokho and Khoshaknik .. from Ajdanakan to Nakhjawan fortressThe protesters and he considered the inhabitants of Kham and nakhjawan and ... as the sons of Ajydak and Mars – the Medes - Who lived freely in Masis - Ararat - and Armenia. Minorski correctly thinks that Khorni means Kurds by them, "It is not doubtful that Khorni meant the Kurds by Mars" (Minorsky, 1958, in trans by Khadem, 1387/2008: 180). Khornni described the inhabit-ants of Khorram, the main place of Khurdamin, as Kurds.

As we wrote out, many historians consider Khurdamin movement to be the continuation of the Mazdakian movement. Mazdakai lived secretly after the killings by Anoushirvan, and after the disappearance of the Sassanid, they reappeared in the form of Khurdamin in the era of Islam. "Babak's movement in Azerbaijan and Jabal ... had maintained the persistence of the struggle of Mazdak's followers in the Sassanid era in these areas. Althym's Wisheffer correctly related a social aspect to the Geomatian uprising and considered him a predecessor to Mazda-kians. Aliyev and Diakonov correctly recognized the entry of class culture as the cause of the decay of the Median empire and Astyag. Vishofer also expanded the same conditions that caused Astyag to fall to Goemeta. In all these movements, common ideas can be extracted. All writers believe that G'omata revealed the Median being and anti-Persian nature of his up-rising after eight months that he became sure from the foundations of his power. Therefore, if Mazdakians had the opportunity, they would reveal the Kurdish/Median being aspect of their uprising. Of course, we have no information, Anooshirovan may have eliminated all the writings of Mazdak, maybe they revealed them but we are not aware of them. Therefore, the history of the Kurds from Zahhak (Astyag) to Gomata and Mazdakyen to Khurdamin and ... is a complete history for writing the history of political and social thought of Kurds.

In this chapter of the study, we will end the history of the Kurds with the Khoramandin; not rather that the history of the Kurds will end in Khoramdiann, but because we have just proved

the Kurd existence in this chapter. We will postpone the analysis and ways of existenzializing this being in the following chapters. Because there were doubts about the existence of these movements, we focused on them. There is no doubt about the Kurd being of contemporary movements. Of course, there has also been attempts to conceal the truth of Kurd in contemporary times. The fact that the Kurds are called the mountainous Turks... and that they are termed like the Mazdakis and Khurdamin as infidel and ... all are definitely trying to conceal the truth of their being Kurd. However, there has been a difference between now and earlier in such a way that history can not be monopolized by the kings like Ataturk and Reza Khan in the contemporary world so that no body be able become aware of the Kurd beings of these movements. There was no longer the possibility of concealing these movements due to the expansion of Kurdish historical consciousness and the expansion of the world of communications and information and the arrival of European citizens in the region.



## Part Two:

# The Development, Consolidation and Formulation of Iran Political Rationality in Contrast to Kurd

## Chapter Three:

# The Formation of Iran Political Ration against Kurds

## Quest for Identity

### Introduction:

Why was Cyrus<sup>1</sup> called the Savior the Christ, the Father and the Lawmaker in the mythology and religious culture of the Aryans / Sami and Greek, but the Medes and the Astyages as the Ajydahak, the Ahriman, the Seed (Tuxme) sof Tyamat, the Unwise, and ...? Why were the Medes driven to the fringes of history, and the Persians entered the corridors of history? To answer these questions, we should reach the zero point of the history in which Kurds (Mede / Gutha) were badged as Ahriman, Evil and Inviolent, and Iranians as goodness and wisdom of Ahoori. The zero Point in which the boundary between wisdom and debauchery, Ahura (God) and Ahriman (Devil), goodness and evil, Logos and Eros, and others, have been constructed and so separated from each other that they have interrupted the path of any exchange. It was the time when the violent crackdown of the Kurds through their devious repulse actualized and became permanent in the governmance of truth.

The basis of our work is to examine the development of Iranian political ration and its “the other”-making mechanisms. Iran's political ration was developed after the defection and nonseparation of the Kurds / Medes and after the calm caused by the suppression and rejection of Kurds. Iranism has lost its true essence via being abstracted into Ahura, goodness and ... as the true essence of the Kurds has been got away from them with the title of Ahriman, Satan and Ajydak. Therefore, to reach the zero point and the beginning of the distance and separation of the Persians from the Kurds and the way the Kurds were rejected, the critique of the sky should be turned into the critique of the earth, the critique of theology to critique of politics, and the critique of politics into the critique of ethnic domination. Criticism of Iranian reason is the critique of its religion and its theology. The critique of Iranian religion and theology is the critique of ideology and critique of its ideology is a critique of its policy and critique of its policy is the ritique of its social structure and its ethnic domination. 2 Criticism of Iranian Intellect is the criticism of Iranian its” thoughtful despoticism”. The criticism of Iranian ration has eliminated the imaginary flowers from the chain of Persian domination, so that the bondage of the chain would become apparent. The critique of Iran's political wisdom has destroyed the symbolic flowers of the dominant hedge of ethnic domi-nation of Persia to reveal the captive hedge thorns. Therefore, the purpose of this research, on the one hand, is to critique the Iranian political intellect, the means and justifications of the Iranian tyranny and the ethnic domination of Pars, and, on the other hand, the conceptualization of the Kurdish political movements.

In this section, we will discuss the reaction and the way of the Iranians / Persians interaction with the Kurds (the Medes) during the rule of Achaemenids before Darius. Further, we will state that the basis of the formation of both mental dimensions (religious myths) and objective (social / political structure) of the Iranian political intellect has become significant in contrast to the Median / Mithraism identity. The political / social dimension of Iranian rationality with the central signifier of Farah Izadi and the components of the celestial legitimacy/divine right, hierarchical/class justice (Plato), Religious/metaphysical culture (logos), Hermetic knowledge, has been developed based on the negation and the other-making of the Medes, with components of primitive democracy, terrestrial legitimacy/social contract, equality/shared justice, earthly / dionysus (eros) culture, and the Prometheus spirit. From the viewpoint of the mental dimension, the development of religion and mythology of Persia was in the opposite of Mede / Mitra. Zoroaster against Mitra, Fereydoun and Keikhosrow against the Toran, Zahak and Vindhid of Avesta against the Mithraism symbols. First of all, we will criticize and reject the routine and unfounded views of the peaceful transfer of power from Mede to Pars, the shared domination of Mede and Pars, the Median-being of Cyrus, the kinship of the Medes and Persians through the presentation of a brief history of the Medes, on the one hand, and, We will try to prove that the basis of the Achaemenid / Iranian empire was socially / politically and ritually / religiously was established on the negation of the Medes and against them.

#### Pars, Mede: Interaction or Conflict -History

##### of the Medel:

If we accept Herodotus's account of the hierarchy of the Median kings, the history of the first kingdom of Mede began in the year 700 AC which is simultaneous with the peak of the Assyrian military power at the time of Sargen (720-705) in the north and in the central Zagros (Brown, 1988: 111). According to Herodotus, Diaco is the true founder of the Mad State (Herodot, 2008, 77) Which was elected as ruler and arbitrator for the resolution of disputes and the administration of justice following the agreement of the tribal Median/Mannai chiefs 3. In 715, he was exiled probably due to the failure to pay tribute or rebellion along with a new assault of Assyrians on Homs in Syria (Zarinkob, 1368/1989: 89) 4. In 709, he returned to Mede and again became a ruler after fleeing from exile, or after the Assyrians' own agreement, or to obtain a tribute from the Medians systematically under the leadership of Diaco, or to unite the Medes against the Uratians or the newly arrived Iranians. His 53-year rule (Herodotus, 1987, in trans by Mazandarani, 1384/2005: 79) came to an end in 678 (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/ 2009: 320) 5. In 678, the Median "Keshterita" who is the same "Ferartes" of Herodotus in the Assyrian sources (Bivar, 2005: 342), the successor to Diako, aroused (Assarhaddon's) concern in the Assyrian borders (Zarinkob, *ibid*: 89) 6. Assyrian resources do not say anything regarding the result of the war and the fate of Keshtryth. Perhaps contrary to Herodotus, who considered the Scythians' invasion in the period of Hovkshth 7, it was in Keshtrita's time and Keshtrita was defeated by the Scythians. (Grishman, 1976, in trans by Mo'in, 1388/2009: 99). After 28 years of rule of the Scythians - 625 - 653 BC. - Hovkshchtra - in the words of Herodotus - reunified the Medes with the killing of the Sikhs. Probably Keshterita died in 650 and Hawkshahra became the ruler about 622 and after 28 years of rule of the Scythians. He conquered Assyrians in 612 and died in 585 8. After Hovkshchthar, Astyag

sat on the throne. He was attacked by the Iranians in the year 554 under the leadership of Cyrus and his allies, Babylonians and Armenians, and then it was de-feated after four years of resistance and mede camel under the control of the Persians 10. It should be noted that we will continue to consider that this is the official narrative of Herodo-tus, which has been seriously skeptical since the discovery of the Assyrian and Babylonian resources, since there are no indications that in the Assyrian and Babylonian sources about the number of Mede kings or under a superior rulers or single Shah.

#### The sunrise of the Achaemenid Persians and the sunset of the Kurdish Medians

There are various views about the relationship between Mad and Pars, the ways to change the monarchy and the subsequent relationship of the Medes with the Persians in the Achaemenid Empire and .... Some scholars 11 have considered Medes and Persians as relatives, and the transfer of superiority from Med to Pars as a simple change of monarchy with the consent of the Medians themselves. In contrast, some other scholars 12 have regarded it not as the simple transfer of monarchy, but as looting the Medes and making them slaves in the true sense (Aliev, *ibid*: 415) which transcended a simple change in the dynasty of the kingdom, and it meant a geographical power transmission with all the political and moral consequences (Champdor, 1952, in trans by Ghazi, 1384/2005:s. 82).

Before exploring domination change from Med to Persia, Cyrus's personality and goals must be clarified. Cyrus is the king whose history has become the poetry (Herder, cited in Hinz, 1987, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 87). The entire history of the formation of the Achaemenid empire has been shaped under the guise of the personality of Cyrus. The historians 13 in describing the for-mation of the Achaemenid Empire do not name any Persian tribe and not even any other his-torical personality, even Cyrou's cylinder introduces him not as the forerunner of a people, but a person. (Grigorevich, 1985, in trans by Shalgoni, 1387/2008:656). Thus, the formation of the Persian / Iranian Empire and the defeat and conspiracy of Mud, without knowing the character of Cyrus the task unfinished.

#### Cyrus, from Myth to Reality:

As we said, Cyrus' story has turned into poetry and myth in the history. The narrations and stories presented about him and his performance are not compatible with the personality of the ruler who has spent all his life engaged in the seizure of other countries. But where have the roots of these narratives originated from in which Cyrus and the entire Persians empire have been interpreted in terms of kindness and pluralism instead of violence and plunder and, and have been marked with the scientific and historical badge? Why did such an aggressive and occupying people and system that made the Medes as their own slaves become known as a tolerant and saviour people? What has been recorded in the name of history science in Iran is nothing more than a retelling of Persian mythology of worshiping kings. The narrative regarding Cyrus is not historical / political, but mythical and constructed; thus, there should be criticized the narratives that made Cyrus prominent. In the following chapters, we will discuss how was the story of Cyrus human rights and liberalism constructed. Here it should be only

mentioned that this story is rooted in the Iranian myths of Shah (king) worshipping which Herodotus, the father of the history gave the scientific / historical aspect to it.

One of the reasons that Herodotus made Cyrus the most prominent and ideal of all the other Persian kings like Cambyses and Darius is that Herodotus himself was involved in the Iranians and Greeks conflict occurring during the time of Khashayar Shah and Darius and Cyrus had not fought with Greece and, therefore, focused on the positive aspect of Cyrus (Wiesehofer, 2001, in trans by Saqibfar, 1377/1998: 77). The main purpose of Herodotus was to commemorate the victory of the main Greek lands on the Persians in 490 and 480 wars, and the value of his information regarding the chronological order and what previously happened on the Pars empire was quite trivial. (Kuhrt, 2007: 7)

Also the difference existing in the image of Kurosh goodness and Cambujia madness is derived from the narrations of Persian aristocrats themselves. "The contradiction between the personality of Cyrus and Cambyses is the reflection of the official traditional Persian narration." (Dandamayev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab, 1373: 139). The news of Herodotus, which Cameron described regarding Cyrus goodness and Zener described about Cambyses' insanity, is also taken from the source of Iranian news (Danmadyev, *ibid*: 227). This source of Iranian news was the same aristocracy (Dunmadyev, *ibid*), which Cambujia policies, contrary to Cyrus, were not in line with the benefit of their plundering. After the end of the conquests and bloodsheds, Cambyses sought to limit the aristocracy's power to centralize it; therefore, the Persian nobles, who were the source of Herodotus's information, described the Cambyses in contrast to Cyrus, who dispatched the flood of plunders (bootys) of conquered lands into aristocracy, as crazy and violent. "Cyrus aimed at further conquests that strengthened tribal aristocracy and expanded its sphere of influence ... Cambodia sought to eliminate the powers of the traditional aristocracy ... Herodotus reference to the strictness of Cambyses reflects the dissatisfaction of Persian aristocrats with him. Herodotus received his information from Zupirus, who is the symbol of the Persian aristocracy, an aristocracy that had found Kamoyiyah's actions to organize a strong central government to the detriment of his own tribal relations and called them crimes." (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 141).

The Cyrus letter of Xenophon, which has raised up Cyrus as a top-notch excellent model, based on the unanimous view of the historians, is not a history but a storytelling book (Wiesehofer, 2001, in trans by Saqibfar, 1377/1998: 71; Dyakonoff, 1985, in trans by Keshavarz, 1379/2000: 49; Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 34; Shahbazi, 1349/1970: 100). This is not a historical but an educational book. Xenophon, a student of anti-democratic Socrates, was trying to present an anti-democracy model for Greece. In this regard, notice this sentence in which he compares the people of Persia to a submissive cattle in front of the Shah and Cyrus as the Shepherd "I saw that the ruling over man was harder than being the shepherd of animals, the animals are not rebellious and... and they have complete obedience of the shepherds ... but humans are rebellious against the ruler ... then I realized that it is more difficult for man to rule over his own species than other animals ... but when I saw Cyrus ... I acknowledged that it is not difficult to rule over human type" (Xenophon, n.d., in trans by Karimi, 1350/1971: 3). As with Plato, Xenophon tries to provide a hierarchical model against democracy, a democracy that was not compatible with their family aristocracy and he could not digest it because of Socrates execution. This is why he introduced the Iranian system and the Cyrus character as a despotic / royal pattern against Greek democracy and he presented a subtle and popular character of

Cyrus for making its acceptance easier; thus, he concealed the roots of his violence and the manner in which he came to power; in contrast, he considered Cyrus as the groom of Astyagh and the Median soil as Astyagh's trousseau to Cyrus. As we can see, Xenophon presents a model of the lordly system in front of the Greek system of democracy: "Cyrus has always been accustomed to saying that a good king is no different from a shepherd. As the shepherds care for the herds in order to take advantage of them, the king also observes obedience from his subordinates to provide them with their bliss (Xenophon, *ibid*: 258). Therefore, the Iranian system has been the system of lords / serfs or god/servitude during the time of Cyrus. It is not just the nobility/Spartan view of Xenophon that has modeled on Cyrus and the system of Achaemenid shepherds / herds as he considered the greatest Iranian art as being obedient and subordinate to the Shah (Farshad Mehr, 1385/2006: 45), Herodotus also made an entirely difference between Iranians and Greeks through pure submission, and the slavery-like obedience to greed and tyranny (Rawlinson's introduction to Herodotus, 1987, in trans by Mazandarani, 1384/2005: 17). Indeed, the entire opposers of democracy in Greece were enthralled by Cyrus (Cook, 1983, in trans by Saqibfar, 1389/2010: 29). As it was proud that (the war and massacre, and the aristocracy, it was a pride of honor), which made the Greeks especially the Xenophon to the Persians (Cook, *ibid*: 346). Because Cyrus and the Achaemenid political system, the ideal model of the oligarchic tyranny and anti-democracy. The political freedom and politics of Greek democracy describe the Greeks as saying: "People gather in their fields to swear allegiance to each other" (Herodotus, cited in Zarrinkob, 1368/1989: 120). The difference between Cyrus's philosophical horizons with democracy and human rights is that the anti-democratic aristocracy, like Xenophon, who was from the disciples of Socrates and Socrates, was one of the greatest enemies of democracy, who loved Cyrus.

One of the other sources that introduced Cyrus as the hero, moral, and human rights symbol is Cyrus' own cylinder which according to Manual Cook is not human rights but the flattery of the gods (Cook, *ibid*: 43). It is written in Cyrus' own words in the same cylinder: "I made the land of Gothium and Mindha (both of them are the same Medes) and ... submissive and forced them to pay tribute and kiss my legs" (Cyrus Cylinder, cited in Cook, *ibid*: 67). This failure and bringing tribute and also kissing royal foot is not human rights and democracy, but it is between Lord / serf relation. In addition, the Cylinder is the narration of Cyrus himself, it is natural that it represents himself as good and enemies as evil.

The reason why the Babylonian and Jewish priests have described him as savior, as some historians have pointed out - we will continue to discuss it - was the result of the propaganda of Cyrus' preachers. The voice of the priests is not the voice of the common people. It does not make any difference for the priests who the king was as far as their pockets were filled and they were given freedom to carry out their own ceremony. As for the peasants (aristocrats) and Iranian clerics, it did not make any difference whether Shah (king) was Yazdgerd or Anoushirvan, the Mughal Aljathi (Khaja Nasir al-Din al-Tusi) or the Sultan of Seljuk (Ghazali and Nizam al-Mulk) or Shah Isma'il Sufi. The same Babylonian priests who made Cyrus the guardian and legitimized him, also did the same for Alexander the Macedonian "This issue that Babylonian priests accepted the role of Cyrus as the beloved of Mordecai is not surprising, according to their belief, the victory of Cyrus was the providence of God ... similar name was given to the king of Seluki, Antiochus I, as the agent of the gods of Ezila and Ozyda, the temples and the gods of Babylonia." (Boyce, 1982, in trans by San'atizade, 1381/2002: 97). The

popularity among people was not important for the kings like Cyrus to seek refuge in people rather than the priests. The priests offered metaphysical legitimacy to Cyrus using religion and temples in return of receiving salaries and certain concession, as Iranian clerics gave them to Mongols, Seljukites, Turks and Arabs.

Cyrus has no particular difference with Timur Lang, Nader Shah, Shah Isma'il 16, and .... Since the day he sat on the throne to the end of his life, he was engaged in battle and capture of the other lands. The difference between Cyrus and Nader and Shah Abbas is that during the Safavid period, there were historians other than the court historians who wrote the facts beyond the writing of the kings. But at the time of Cyrus, historical realities have survived based on their own language and their inscriptions, which is definitely the arbitrariness and good demonstration of oneself knowing the others as evil. No Safavid historians has referred to the killing and massacre at the hands of Shah Isma'il from the Safavids but Italian Orientalists have narrated them (Taheri, 1380/2001: 182). But during the Cyrus reign, there were neither Orientalists like Shardin nor today's satellite communications to write out the facts out of the king's own interpretation. Thus, Cyrus becomes a symbol of human rights, and the Safavids as the symbol of degeneration and degradation. While there was neither any difference between the real personality of Cyrus with Shah Isma'il and Abbas, nor between their state system. The true personality of Cyrus in a nutshell can be heard from the words of Tomiress, the Scythians Queen who called Cyrus a thirsting vampire and said: "Oh the thirsty of blood, I will quench your thirst with blood" (Cook, cited in Gerchevitch, *ibid*: 251). The reason behind the Cyrus character becoming kind is exiting his character out of the history and its mythifying. The myth refines reality and makes it innocent (Barthes, 1915, in trans by Daghighian, 1375/1996: 72). The Cyrus epic is mixed with the religious myths of IndoEuropeans (Frye, 1974, in trans by Anoshe, 1379/2000: 136) and this ideal Cyrus is the same legendary Kaykhsrou and Fereydoun and the myths of Keykhsrou and Fereydoun was molded on Cyrus and Greek historians have sealed it with the stamp of history. In order to clarify the subject, it is useful to give other examples of how Cyrus like Timur and Nader have turned from a rapist and occupier personality into a legendary figure and the symbol of human rights.

In Sassanian mythology, the Sassanid kings' hard attitudes towards persons have been interpreted as mild and ... treatments based on the Romans and Greeks writings. For example, Shapur I takes Ghanvash, the Roma commander, everywhere ... or the daughter of the Tayer Shah of Yemen, the castle of al-Hazr, marries Shapur II and hands in the castle through patriotism (Pirnia, 1383: 71). But according to the historical information available and the simultaneous historians of Rome and Greece have pointed out: Shapur I has killed Giannush with violence and captured AlHazer castle with great conflict and marries the queen through force. While Cyrus who captures Media after three years of war and engagement and handed on Amothis by killing his husband forcibly, the Medes themselves surrendered to Cyrus in the mythology and even the story of Xenophon and Herodotus, and Astyag - in Xenophon narration- gave his daughter to Cyrus and donated the whole land of Mede to Cyrus as his daughter's dowry. What was the difference between Shapur and ... Sassanids, Safavids, and Mongolians with Cyrus that all of them were known as the brutal bloodthirsties and Cyrus as the marker of human rights? The difference is that there was no historical awareness in the Achaemenid and Cyrus era. History - As Klima says- was the inscriptions of the kings and their orders and no body had the right to question the narration of kings about historical facts. The earliest Greek historians also wrote history at least 100 years after Cyrus.

When the history was mixed with the mythology and the narration of Iranian legendary were mistakenly written in the name of history. The killing by the Safavid kings was also revealed by orientalist. If they did not exist and we would look at history from the point of view of the Safavid state documents, then Shah Isma'il 1 and Shah Abbas's personality would definitely be a better symbol of human rights. Therefore, the mystery of the moralization of Cyrus personality is that there was no historical consciousness to reveal his oppression and massacres, and this fact that Iranian mythology was written by Mogis/ Aristocrats and not the general public has made Cyrus a holy, great and moral personality. But then some people may ask where were the books of the Jewish religion and the Babylonian calendar that have introduced Cyrus as a guardian originated?

The answer to this question can be twofold: one is that calling the foreign factor as the savior and welcoming it by the priests of each nation has not just been limited to Cyrus. The Egyptians and the priests also saw Alexander as a heavenly guardian who saved them from the yoke of the Persians, and called Alexander the Divine Pharaoh. The same priests of Babylon who made Cyrus as the savior also did the same with Alexander (Zarinkoub, 1368/1989: 28 - 210). Cyrus entering Babylon did not mean its people's unconditional agreement with him, but it is similar to the arrival of Alexander to Babylon to show their loyalty to the conqueror that is the fate of the conquered city" (Briant, 2002, in trans by Ferrogan, 1387/2008: 66). The same Iranian Mogs went on singing to welcome Alexander while entering Babylon (Widngren, 1968, in trans by Farhang, 1377/1998: 266). How about the Iranian clerics giving holiness to Mongols (by Khaje Nasir Tusi) and Seljuks (by Ghazali, and Nizam al-Mulk)?

Secondly, the Nabonid calendar that praises Cyrus, as he has proved with document, is Cyrus's own propaganda. (According to Shahbazi, the same, 5). "Pierre Briant" realized this issue and wrote: "Cyrus was constructed as a sacred personality based on the texts of Waghaye Name, Cyrus cylinder, Torah and the Greek sources of Cyrus and the Greek sources who was a savior authority and conquered each state with the consent of the people of that country, which is suspicious, because it corresponded with the propaganda of Persians regarding Cyrus" (Briant, 2002, in trans by Ferrogan, 1387/2008: 62). The writings of Isaiah are in agreement with the spirit of the Babylonian doctrine in praise of Cyrus. The style of writing texts that have praised Cyrus is directional (biased) as the time of their compiling by the Babylonian priests was only after the fall of Babylon at the hands of the Persians. The content of the texts was in harmony with the new King's orders ... like the inscriptions of the Assyrians a century ago. "(Dandamayev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab, 1383/2004: 83). Nabonid's calendar is similar to Cyrus's cylinder in style and content. Cyrus had already contacted the Babylonian priests who were crazy with Nabonids (Cook, 1983, in trans by Saqibfar, 1389/2010: 66) and he had purchased them with his vacant promises. Nabonid had tendency to worship god of Sin in front of Mordec, the respectful god of the priests which led to a reduction in the validity of the Marduk temples, thereby reducing the temple's economic benefits for the priests. Like the Qurayshans' opposition to the Prophet Muhammad, not because of religion, but because of the economic benefits coming from the Ka'bah idols (Al-Jaberi, 1984/2005, in trans by Al-e Mehdi, 1389/2010: 159). Cyrus made the priests content with the promise of nationalizing God of Mordec, and the revival of financial aid to the temple. Therefore, the peaceful arrival of Cyrus to Babylon was the later construction of the priests and Cyrus himself, not the historical fact. Both Xenophon and Herodotus pointed out that the Cyrus armies killed everybody either on the street or at the royal palace (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 77; Champdor, *ibid*: 292). The Cyrus burned



the Akkad people in the fire and massacred them (Cook, *ibid*: 64; Olmsted: 1948, in trans by Moghadam, 1384/2005: 68-69). In the words of Will Durant, Cyrus has had an atrocious cruelty (Durant, 1885, in trans by Aram, 1378/1999: 290).

If Cyrus was the Savior of Babylon, they would not rebel in the time of the central power vacuum, nor would give the names of those who Cyrus killed to the insurgent leaders. "The naming of the two usurpers (during the riots of Darius) under the title of the last honorable King of Kaldani, NebuchadNaser indicates political or even national reaction against the ruling of Pars " (Gershevitch, *ibid*: 671). This is the sign of the popularity of the leaders killed by Cyrus and the Cyrus monophytes. In the same way, according to the inscription of Bisotun, Farhortish and ChisertTokhme related themselves to the previous kings of Madad like Hokheshtera to question the legitimacy of the destructor of the Mede Empire, i.e. Cyrus.

Whether Cyrus had not burned and plundered the temples built by Nabonid in the commemoration of goddess of Sin during the conquest of Babylon with the complicity of the followers of Mordok, and forced supranational goddess with his universal claim to bend on his knees in front of national goddess (Karbassian, 1384/2005: 56). Therefore, Cyrus's religious policy was not derived from his religious free manners, but derived from his goal of having hegemony and domination over the captured lands (Nyberg, 1954: 67). Berossos, Babylonian historian, pointed out that when Cyrus captured Babylon, he commanded to destroy the walls outside the city, because the city was stubbornly resisting in front of him and it was difficult to capture the city (Berossos in Dandamayev, *ibid*: 77).

Why was Cyrus welcomed to Babylon as a savior among the people's rainflowers? "Cyrus knew well what would happen when people led by Gobarro entered the wealthy city of Babylon and how they would slaughter innocents; thus, he kept himself and Pars army away from Babylon until it could enter the city as a freighter and a savior. " (Gershevitch, *ibid*: 650). Gobaro had already killed many of the Babylonian opponents and elders, including Baltasarou ... (Champdor, *ibid*: 279-281) and he had established order and security in Babylon. How many days did Cyrus enter Babylon after several days so that his hands would not be infected with slaughter and even would show off himself as against the killing of his armies in Babylon. Xenophon pointed to a very interesting thing about Cyrus in the Cy-rus News letter: "Cyrus would appear in the chariot among the people when he was sacrificing to the gods; everyone would respect him and bow, and maybe special people were appointed to set as modal for the others in this regard ..." (Xenophon, *ibid*: 264) which also applies to the fabricated welcoming ceremony of Cyrus in Babylon, meaning that Cyrus had previously sent Gobarro to set order, which would certainly not have been done without killing and suppressing the opponents. After the massacre in the palace, Cyrus sent his warriors through the streets of the city and ordered to kill every body they would see, ... he issued a decree indicating the delivery of the weapon ... If someone has a gun, he and his family would be killed " (Xenophon, cited in Champdor, *ibid*: 293) and after the establishment of order, he has appointed special persons to respect him and bow and rain flowers over him, and this flower scattering was carried out by Cyrus's trained comrades as it is the case with today's Basiji, which later propaganda of Cyrus priests related it to the whole Babylon's people.

Mary Boyce has given a full explanation regarding the Jewish Prophets, i.e. Isaiah introduces him (Cyrus) as the Christ of God. According to Boyce, "Isaiah" was relatively an unknown man at that time, or at least had nothing to express against the reputation of Jeremiah that he

introduced Cyrus as Christ and ... gave the promise of the freedom of the Jewish people as the result of the promises of giving the leadership of the Jewish people to him (Boyce, 1979, in trans by Bahrami, 1381: 71). To prove the correctness of Boyce's words, the structural difference between Isaiah words and other Jewish prophets is a good reason. Before Isaiah, "firstly, the word of Christ was utilized for no non-Jewish person that is the sign of the skill propagandists (Boyce, *ibid*: 73). Jeremiah talks about the sins of the Jewish people and of the mighty and hard-taking God (Yahwa) while in Isaiah, instead of the sins of the Jews, he speaks of their free-dom and liberation, and instead of the righteous and rebellious Lord, he speaks about a kind father (Champdor, *ibid*: 337-338). Isaiah talked about innovative points concerning Christian theology that scholars inevitably have to compare it with the Goths (Byce, *ibid*: 73). C. S. Turie believes that all references to the book of Isaiah to Cy Thrus and Babylon are the next fabrications. Smith believes that Isaiah was later called as a traitor to the tradition (Sunnah) as the result of calling Cyrus as Christ (Danmadeyev, *ibid*: 93). In spirit and content, there are many similarities between Isaiah's book and Cyrus's cylinder (*ibid*). Cyrus's agent talked to the Jewish prophecy regarding the greatness of Ahuramazda with the media-tor of Cyraus, and Isaiah has accepted this image and has given it to Yahwa (Lord) (*ibid*: 76). A Mog who was familiar with the Goths must have been Zoroastrians. Cyrus promised to spread the Zoroastrian religion after the failure of Astyagh (Boyce, *ibid*). Yahwa was just the God of the Jewish people before Isaiah, not the God of heaven and earth ... Before Isaiah there was no news of salvation and of Christ and ... . But there was more emphasis on the sins of the people. "The words of the Isaiah the Prophet was surprising for the followers that a non –Jewish man be the Messiah of God" (Hinz: 103). The Jewish Isaiah borrowed the concepts of paradise and earth, Satan (devil) and the other world ... from the Zarathustra religion (Bahar, cited in Esmailipur, 1377/1998: 421) Before introducing by the prophets of Cyrus, there was no mean-ing in the name of the devil in the Jewish religion. There was no news of Satan in Towrat.

It was the serpent that deceived Eve (the Torah, cited in Sophocles. (429B.C, in trans by Maskob, 1385/2006, in the introduction). Therefore, according to Vincent's theory, the verses of Isaia the prophet were written at the time of Darius in Jerusalem during the rebuilding of the temples (Vincent, cited in Boyce, *ibid*: 280) or Zoroastrian propagandists as according to the resemblance of Isaiah's verses with the Goths and Yasna were definitely Zoroastrians and they have mod-uled them with their own promises. Nehemiah and Azra, who have spoken about Cyrus and his Jewish believing, were the cupholders of Ardeshir before becoming the governor of Jeru-slim. Ezra, Nichma and Haji are the Jewish Prophets who came to the rank of glory at the court of Ardeshir (FarshadMehr, 1385/2006: 231). The Biblical book of Ozra, which calls Cyrus as Christ, was found in Ekbatan's archives during the time of Darius I, which Vlhhausen and Cöcströs have doubted it because of the type of Jewish-oriented phrasalization (Yamauchi, 1937, in trans by Pezeshk, 1390/2011: 85). The Book of Izra spoke about the help of the royal treasury to the Jews, but Haji and Zakaria's book have not said anything about the royal monetary sponsorship which casts doubts regarding the correctness of the promises mentioned in these verses of Azra (*ibid*: 86). These prophets, the cupholders of Achaemenid kings, rebuilt their temples with the Achae-menid money and they took the Jews to Babylon and made them seem prisoners of the Baby-lonians in order to convert Cyrus into Christianity. But if they had really been slain, then why only a few of them returned to Jerusalem after allowing from behalf of Cyrus. Hintz and some other philo-Iranian scholars believe that their economic progress in Babylon is the cause behind their not returning to Babylon. But they do not explain where in

the world, the slave has been allowed to progress economically and to inflict market? Thus, the Jews were not at all slaves. They were completely free in Babylonia in reading their own poems and in doing economic affairs (Champdor, *ibid*: 270). Indeed, at that time, Egypt ruled Jerusalem, and Jeremia dissatisfied with this demanded Bokht-ul-Nasr to invade Jerusalem and liberate the Jews from the domination of the infidel Egyptians (Shahbazi, interview). The story of the Jews being slaves and their liberation by Cyrus is a legend of Cyrus and his propagandists. Cyrus is neither savior nor Christ the guardian, but one of the cleverest kings of his history. The reason of his intelligence was that he wrote his own interpretation of historical events and molded it on history. Thus, after many centuries, "today's improvisers, like ancient historians, see him as the symbol of human rights" (Briant, *ibid*). However, finding about Cyrus's wickedness does not require the argumentation of history, since he was continually fighting and raping others from the day he became king until his death and this the best reason for his tyranny and domineering personality and that conquering other countries is not possible anywhere in the world without blood and slaughter.

The favorable view of Cyrus and Cambodius toward religions had two causes: one was the necessities of time- for instance, the use of the Jews to attack Egypt- and the other was the primacy of their religion, which could not compete with the religions of the east (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 331). Grishman has well noted this point and he has pointed out that if the Roman Empire tried to attract the culture and economy of dominating nations, it would result in their advancement given the more advanced basis of the general culture of Rome in relation to the defeated nations since the underlying domination of Rome was semi-savage, but the state of affairs differed considerably from Rome in the period of Darius and Cyrus. If the Achaemenids who compared the civilized nations such as Egypt, Babylon, the Greek islands and Media with their own civilization, this would count as a descending affair as they were aware of the cultural superiority of the old civilizations (Grishman, 1976, *intrans* by Mo'in, 1388/2009: 135-136). Thus, their intelligent policies in the non-imposition of Persian culture and language was not due to their liberating behaviour, but unlike Rome, it was due to this fact that it was the conquering nation who was semi-wild and borrowed the culture, and even their language from the defeated nations. In fact, like the Mongols, they had nothing to impose and mold on the others, "Mongols toleration with the religious beliefs of the different nations in their empires is well-known at least as long as they converted to Islam, and even afterwards," (Sattari, 1383/2004: 101). Many emphasize on this point that Cyrus, unlike the Caliphs of the Islamic period, did not impose his religion upon the people under his rule, but this conception was the result of their inadequate understanding of the history of religions. Concepts such as dogmatism and religious prejudice only emerged after the advent of Christianity and had little position in the old religions. "(Dandamayev, 1381/2002: 139). The term "thousand gods" by Hittite writers showed the mixing of various gods and their acceptance among hostile nations ... and that the dominant nation also accepted the gods of the defeated people ... that later it became a part of the Achaemenid policies" (Razi, 1382/2003: 84). "Neither Cyrus nor Cambyses knew anything as tolerance and religious freedom. There was absolutely no such a thing throughout the whole empire" (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 87). Cyrus style was similar to that of the Hittites and the Assyrians. Hermana noted the similarity between the writing style of the Cyrus cylinder with the inscription of Assur Bonai Pal (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 82). According to Walker Cyrus' cylinder Crushed was a model for constructing buildings in Assyria and Babylon, not the human right statement (Walker, 1972: 159). The crushed pieces of Cyrus cylinder in

“Nis” museum was reconstructed by “Berger”. In this text, Cyrus explicitly describes the Ashur-e Bani Na-pal, the great king of Assyria, as his political model (Anzeig von CB Walker.Iran-1971). Cy-rus tried to connect himself with the successful previous rulers of Mesopotamia after discovering an inscription from Aššurbanipal I (Kuhrt, 2007: 51)

However, another reason for representing kings such as Cyrus, Darius, and Anoushirvan as fair and truthful and their opponents as liars, oppressors and devils goes back to the description of justice in the Sultani order. Political order is the continuation of the cosmic order in the classical philosophy and Shah is the earthly parallel of God. As Amhaspandan must have absolute obedience to God, other classes and social forces must also obey the Shah as God on earth. Also, the political order is likened to the human body in this royal order in which in the head must rule over other members, and justice is realized in the absolute obedience of other members, such as lust and stomach, from the human brain or his wisdom. In the classical political order, Shah is the symbol of the wisdom, brain and knowledge of mankind, and other classes and ordinary people are the markers of lust, stomach and usurpation which all must have absolute obedience from the episteme (knowledge) or Shah, which is the symbol of the head of the body of political order. In Tensar letter, it is emphasized that people are four members of the body and their head are the king (Minoi, 1354/1975: 57). Mazdayesna ... has similarized the good religion to a tree, four branches of that tree are four social classes ... the king has stood over them all (Dinkard: 209, cited in Zaehner, 1956, in trans by Badraie, 1377/1998: 88). Darius says in the epitaph of his tomb: "The great god is Ahuramazda ... who created joy for the people, and sent reason and seriousness to Darius the Shah" (Hinz, 1969, in trans by Rajabi, 1385/2006: 83). Darius was the symbol of reason and seriousness, and the people were the symbol of happiness; therefore, wisdom must dominate instinct and happiness in the classical political wisdom. The Platonic state consists of various social classes, each of which represents a particular spirit, and each soul represents a kind of special human nature. These kinds are constant and irrevocable, and any attempt to change them, that is, to eliminate the differences between rulers, guards and ordinary people, would bring about disaster and such a change would denote uprising against the laws of human being immutable nature in which social order should be in accordance with these laws. (Cassirer, (n.d), in trans by Movaqin, 1377/1998: 181-182). In the framework of the old thought in which Sultani order defined its boundaries, Cyrus was the parallel of Ahura Mazda or Marduk, and his political order followed the celestial order of gods, and opposition to the hierarchical order of the Cyrus meant opposition to the natural laws and celestial order of the gods, and as the result it was opposition to justice. For this reason, opponents of political order have been nicknamed as "cruel, liar, evil, and so on" since sources of oppositions have not reached our hands and history has been composed by the conquerors. Of course, we know the opponents as brutal and ruthless and the rulers as good and righteous. While the concept of justice, in the sense of equality, was developed in opposition to the cosmic order and the terrestrial symbols of that class order, and we cannot consider the verbal commonality of justice to mean the existence of justice in the kingdom order. Today, however, when our understanding of justice means equality, not hierarchy, we need to reevaluate values and to reverse the kingship truths, in order to understand the true truth that has been reversably represented by the kings. In fact, by rejecting the ruling view of the kings, we refuse the rejection of reality.

Cyrus replaced the external serving based on the sword with the servitude of the hearts. Cyrus removed external extermination by internalizing the coercion. Cyrus removed the faith in

liberation by giving authority to faith. Cyrus converted faith in tolerance utilizing sword into blood. Cyrus replaced the domination depending on "punishment" with "watching out" of domination. Cyrus destroyed the faith in freedom through replacing it with bread (spoils). Cyrus human rights and freedom were not the motive of his sword, but the means of it.

- Peaceful transfer of power or conquering and plundering Media:

Unlike the common narratives, Cyrus / Achaemenids overcame Medes neither through peace nor the Medes' appeal but through long and hard wars with the hard struggle of the Medes, and overcoming Mede turned into such an important event in the emerging history of Pars, which became the main subject of the Persian / Iranian mythology, and Cyrus abstracted from a historical personality into a mythical and symbolic one, as the Medes and Astyagh became the unpopular other of Iranian myths.

Cyrus used to collaborate with Nabonid to eliminate Median political domination. "In order to prevent the attack of Astag on Cyrus realm, Nabonid carried out some military operations around Haran region to make Medes busy. His action prevented Astyagh from swiftly trying to punish Cyrus and suppress his rebellion. "(Zarinkob, *ibid*: 105-106). Nabonid attract-ed the Median army to Babylon and prevented the concentration of Medes' Corps to repel Cyrus. Kourosh had not made Nabondon do this merely through political relations, he had already contacted the Babylonian priests who were full of anger with Nabonid (Cook, *ibid*: 66). In Nabonid dream 17, the god of Sin provoked Nabonid to capture the temple of Haran which was under the control of the Medes, and he called the Medes as "Oman Mande" and called Cyrus tas he Savior, and Christ and Meredok, who would soon sweep away "mighty" armies of "Oman Mande". Cyrus propagandists, as some historians pointed out, had contacted the Babylonian priests and the Jewish Isaia, who was unknown at that time, and the Eastern priests, including Zeroaster the Prophet (s) in order to represent Cyrus as the guardian , and the Medes and Astyagh as hatredess and Azhidehak in substitutes for Cyrus' promises and vows. The result of Cyrus propaganda was that the Medes and Astyagh became known as Oman Mande the seeds of the Timothy, 19 in Armenia, in the narration of Moses Khorni 20, as in the Ajidehak and Dragon, and in the Zoroastrianism o21 in the mythology of the eastern part of Iran, as Ajidehak Zohak / and Ahriman, and In Judaism as Jeniuses and devils. Therefore, the collaboration of the three Iranian / Aryan civilizations, Sami / Mesopo-tamia, Jewish and Armenian, led to the destruction of the Medes. The cooperation of these three civilizations to destroy Media can not be purely due to political reasons; that is, Media had a peace treaty with Babylon, Leeds and Urartu, and ... they had preserved their own kingdom and freedom within the framework of the Median ruling. This was an important event in history and it is the discontinuity of metaphysical history with the earthly identity of the Medes that we will return to it later. This triple partnership of the three metaphysical civilizations also led to the defeat of subsequent Kurdish movements, including Kharaddinists.

Many years before military action against Mede, Cyrus had begun a massive propaganda campaign against the Medes and to his own benifits in all areas. The influence of Cyrus propaganda influenced even in the Medes themselves, and among the Moges and the Median nobility. According to Etiaos and Dion, he read this poetry before Astyagh on the festival night when Cyrus had returned to Persia: "A lion who hunted a boar and let it go ... the boar de-

stroyed the lion ... Astyage found the boar to be Cyrus and ... " (Shahbazi, 1350/1971: 86) 22. The result of Cyrus's propaganda in Media was that via his promises - the promises that he acted upon and the nobles and mogans formed the basis of the rule and foundations of the Achae-menid empire - he mobilized aristocrats like Harpag and Moghan against Astyag and to favo his own faviouir. That is why Astyaga killed the ruthless nobles and the mogan (Herodotus, 1987, in trans by Mazandarani, 1384/2005: 101).

After Astyage's awareness of the Cyrus plot, Astyage called Cyrus. Cyrus replied: "tell Astyagh that I will come to him sooner than he has asked for it "After hearing the message, Asatiag armed his people and followers immediately (Herodoust, *ibid*: 101). Herodotus knew the reason for Persians' uprising in that they were under pressure and they were burning in their quest for Medes wealth (Briant, 2002, in trans by Feroghan, 1387/2008: 23; Herodotus, *ibid*: 100). Later, we will come back to the reasons behind the rebellion (a plan of state theory ...), now we will survey on the way of the Pars rebellion and the median defeat.

Conquest of the Medes was not the Medes' demand, but a three-year war with the corpora-tion of Babylon, Arman, Jews and Bacteria. Herodat regarded conquest of the Medes as their own demand and made the issue simple, while in Babylonian texts, the final battle and the capture of Ekbatan were the last apparent episode that lasted at least three years. Ancient writers such as Katsias, Yustinas and Nikolai Damashghi and Polyanus have described a hard struggle between Medea and Cyrus ... Polylo-nus wrote: "Cyrus fought with Media three times and he failed all three times..., Even after the the initiative defeats of the Pars, many Persians joined Media" (Briant, *ibid*: 49) 24. If the Medes offered the government to Cyrus, why did they spend three years in state of war with him? Cyrus attacked Pasargad Medianl for-tress, which meant protecting the Persian bandits and thugs. After defeatsing for three times, while retreating, the women of Persia raised their skirts and said: "Where do you retreat to from where you came from?". According to the Persian tradition, each time the Achaemenid king arrived in Pasargadae, he would give each Persian woman a coin in return for their previous behavior, even Alexander did it (Hinz, *ibid*: 94-95).

Cyrus's triumph over Media was neither accident, nor fortune, nor the betrayal of the close associates of Ayshtuogue (Briant, *ibid*: 32) but it was a predetermined plan that had accompanied a bloody war for three years. Men and women, children and the old defended Asty-agh against Cyrus; however, medes were defeated. (Herodotus, *ibid*: 101). As many histori-ans have pointed out, the occupation of Mede by Pars was the conquest and hegemony of it in the true sense and not just changing the ruling dynasty (Aliev, *ibid*: 415). Nabunid calender which - as Omested says - is Cyrus's propaganda program and is well in line with Cyrus propaganda and his ruling tells about the looting of Ekbatan by Cyrus (Gershevitch (ed), 1985, in trans by Qaderi, 1387/2008: 644). Astiag was hidden after the defeat in Ekbatan. Cyrus ordered to torture his daughter and children, and Astyagh handed himself in for rescuing her relatives from torture (Catsias, cited in Diakonoff, *ibid*: 390). Ekbatan was looted; the Medes were enslaved and taxes were laid down on them, but Cyrus also made compromising measures to make piece with the Medes, he called himself the king of the Medes ... Gradually, the elders of Mad were removed at the time of Darius and Xeshayer and even the false appearances of the unity of the two kingdoms of Mad and Pars were not observed after Darius the first. Per-sians took Ekbatan and enslaved the people of that city "(Diakonoff, *ibid*: 391; Dandamayev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab, 1373/1994: 137). Herodit also admits that the Medes suffered

from the enslavement of the Persians (Herodotus, cited in Aliev, *ibid*: 422). The inscription of Apadana in Persepolis also depicted the Medes as the pledger (taxpayers) of Pars (A. A. Diakonoff, *ibid*: 79). Cyrus, although apparently left Mad as a monarchy, he determined the ransom on it and appointed a satrap to it (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 176) while - according to Herodotus - the Persians were exempted from tax (Herodotus, cited in Cook, *ibid*: 86).

Therefore, the routine theory of Medes supporting Cyrus and the submission of sovereignty to him is nothing but Cyrus's propaganda and an Iranian legendary narrative. The majority of the people of Mad, along with the Astiag, including the old and the young defended Median existence against Cyrus during three years (Herodotus, *ibid*: 101), and after three years of fierce war, they failed in the war as the result of the intervention of Armenians, Babylonians and Bacteria. After that, the Persian yoke over Medes was so heavy that there appeared many massive insurrections against the Persian domination during the time of Farhuratash and Guamatash.

The common domination of Mede and Pars or domination of Pars on Mede?

Pierre Briant correctly questions the illusion of a common domination of the Medes / the Pars: "If we speak of the shared authority of Mad-Pars, we have gone a wrong way. All the ancient writers glorified Cyrus because he took the superiority from the Medes and transferred it to the Persians. The importance of the Median inheritance must be evaluated with caution in the administrative organization of Cyrus ... The influence of the Ilamians on the Persians is inextricably deeper ... The name of the Mede changed into Khesterpash (Marzban, Qaderi) and, unlike the Persians, Medes had to pay taxes like all other Khesterpashs, there has not been confirmed the existence of any Khesterpash whose residence would be Mede." (Briant, *ibid*: 125) and "military commanders of the Medes" (which, like today's Kermanshahi people, were merely used in military posts by Persians, Qaderi) were to cooperate with the Persian commanders and ... " (Briant, *ibid*: 126). The Cyrus and Cambyses Khesterpashs have risen up without exception from the Persian families (*ibid*).

Along with the uprising of the Median Guamatash, the "the dying King - Cambyses" summoned the most prominent men ones on his bedside, in order to make them not allow the Medes to achieve superiority again" (Briant, *ibid*: 126). This last will of Cambyses in regaining power from the Medes - along with the Guamatash uprising - well shows the monopoly of power in the hands of the Persians and the marginalization of the Medes. If the Achaemenids was the shared domination of the Medes and Persians, neither the Medes would revolt again to revive lost power under the leadership of Guamatash, Frehuratash and Muscovites, nor Cambyses would cry up for the loss of power. Cambyses has not referred to a revival of shared domination, but explicitly referred to the regaining Persian power from the Medes, that is, before the Guomatash uprising, the power and domination was in the monopoly of the Persians led by Cyrus and Cambyses.

The unity of the Medes and the Pars is not more than an illusion. "The apparent absence of the Medes and other tribes in today's important positions has been accepted, and the view that the Medes and Persians are united and turned into a single ethnic group is seriously questionable." (Cook, cited in Gershevitch, *ibid*: 232). There are many reasons that Spatnys, arrowholder of

Darius I, who has come to be Median, is from a Persian family (Cook, *ibid*: 333). Persians used the clothes style of the Medes because the Persians have been carved with Medes' clothes types. The illusion of the participation of the Medes in the Persian empire was constructed. "Apart from Harpag, which was the exception due to being in the service of Cyrus and the betrayal of the Medes in Achaemenid, all the other Achaemenid satraps were Persian. The fifteen officers of Darius were all from Pars and also forty high-ranking officers were Persians. The Achaemenid rule turned into a family affair that they used close relatives" (Cook, *ibid*: 334). In the new empire ... (Persian) there were an ethnically and socially superior group present and local dignitaries were only the hand of this group. We call this group dominant tribe/class and the representatives of Persian aristocratic families formed most members of this tribe/class. Even the royal judges were Persians. " (Briant, *ibid*: 127-126). The combination of the high-ranking staff of the Imperial kingdom clearly shows that the whole of the great aristocratic families that gathered around the Achaemenid dynasties and the cultural traditions of the people of Pars ruled over the kingdom." (Bryan, the same, "553). Gradually, the elders of Mad were removed at the time of Darius and Xerxi, and even the false appearances of the unity of the two kingdoms of Mad and Persia were not followed after Darius the first" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 390).

How many Median nobles have joined the Persian for personal gain is not a convincing reason for the partnership and the convergence of Mede and Pars. The aristocracy considered personal interests and they always followed the owner of the property and, as Polyanus also said, at the time of the first defeats of Cyrus from Astyagh, many Persians joined the Medes (Briant, *ibid*: 49) which definitely does not give a reason for accepting the domination of the Medes and having friendship with them. Iranian aristocrats accepted Alexander's ruling in Babylon and Egypt and participated in the Eskandari system. At the time of the assault of Arabs, Mongols and Seljuks also the Iranian nobles and clerics participated in their system and obeyed them. Therefore, if the participation of some noblemen and clerics is a reason for the religious and kinship and the legitimacy of the rulers' domination, we must inevitably accept the kinship and legitimacy of the domination of the Arabs, Turks and Mongols in Iran.

#### Negation of the Medes and Persians kinship:

We have already said that the Medes are aboriginal inhabitants who lived in Zagros Mountains from the 3,000 years BC. But Persians / Iranians are Aryan immigrants gradually arriving in the plateau later named Iran in the first millennium BC. There are doubts about the word "Parsawa" used in the Assyrian inscriptions along with the Mede term that the Persians and the Medes were together and are related to each other. In the following, we will attempt to react to these doubts.

Some scholars considered 26 names of Parswa in the land of Mad mentioned in the Shalmanasar III inscription in 846 AH as adaptable to Persian ethnic group and they have proposed the idea of Persian migration from the Caucasus and the Median to Pars. The logical consequence of this claim is the belief in the existence of two Persian families in Anshan and Pars and the separation of Anshan and Pars from each other. However, some other scholars<sup>27</sup> correctly do not associate Parsawa with Pars, nor do they accept the hypothesis of the separation of Anshan from Persia and the two Persian families to be true. The Persians came to Persia not from the



Caucasus way, but from Turkestan and the East (Cook, 1983, in trans by Saqibfar, 1389/2010: 22). According to the hypothesis of Kipert and Tomash, the Persian came from Kerman and the east to the current Fars, and the similarity of the Persian language with Parth and Sughdis confirms it (Cook, *ibid*: 22). As we said, the hypothesis of Persian immigration from the Caucasus and Med is based on the hypothesis of the separation of Anshan from Persia and the existence of two Persian dynastic families, both of which have been questioned. Anshans is thirty miles away from Shiraz in the heart of Pars and the theory of two dynasties' ruling is not acceptable (Cook, *ibid*: 247) where Persians built blossoming Pars from the dried land of Ansha (Hinz, 1936, in trans by jahandari, 1361/1982: 56). Anshan was in Pars (Wiesehofer, 1978, in trans by Sedighi, 1389/2010: 28). The names of Anshan and Pars are used to talk about the same conception, as Oman Mandda and Madia are utilized in one sense (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 321).

The title of Shah Anshan in the Babylonian inscriptions and Shah Parsawash of Assur, both belong to one person and one land, and this Parswa is not Median; since it is not used in reference to the name of Shah, but both refers to the south of Iran, that is, Pars (Herzfeld, 1936, in trans by Hekmat, 1354/1975: 54). According to the Nabounid calendar Cyrus took the entire treasury to Anshan after the conquest of Ekbatan and this is the same treasury that is in Pasargadae. Katsias and the Damascus Nicolai have also used Pazaragad for Anshan; therefore, Anshan and Pasargad are both the same area (Herzfeld, *ibid*: 55-56). The names of Anshan and Parsawash are two names of one region, and Winkler's theory which gave two names to two lands is wrong. The racial name of the Parsa was given to the land that was called Anshan before the Aryan invasion (Herzfeld, *ibid*: 57). Therefore, Anshan and Pars are both names of the same land in Pars and it is different from Anshan in Ilam. Thus, the Parsian migration from Median Parswa to Anshan and then to Pars is baseless.

Another hypothesis about the Parsian migration from Mede is the naming of Parswa in the inscription of Shlemanzar III, which the defenders of this hypothesis find it consistent with the Pars ethnic group. Crishman, Hinz, AnBoyle and ....have accepted the Persians' Immigration theory from Zagros to Anshan and then Pars, but Diakonov have rejected it (Yamauchi, 1937, in trans by Pezeshk, 1390/2011: 66). The people of the Parsva state became thoroughly Assyrian through time and Batlimous called the aforementioned land as Syrian-AssyrianMedian (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 157). Diakonov claimed the word Akkadi. i.e. Parsova and the word "Paraso" meant the line and the border and side, and considers Parsova as the Caspian language, and he considered that the only common feature of the term Parsava and Pars was that both meant border and side and There is no documents that Parsov was a Parsian homeland where they had emigrated from it afterwards. Parsovo was an agricultural area whose inhabitants were settled, assuming that its inhabitants abandoned their land and moved to Pars 600 kilometers away is baseless. "The names of persons and places in Parsha are not by any means Iranian" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 155-156). Parsova was a part of the Assyria, and the Assyrian power was so much more robust that it could not have allowed the inhabitants of its captured and to emigrate (Ziapor, 1355/1976: 257). Parsa separated from the main ethnic group in the east (Part and Bacteria ...) and went to Mesopotamia. The similarity between the Persian language and Khwarazmi has been confirmed, and ... The Persian were a branch of the Massagat Union along with the Khwarizmians and they did not go south. The difference between Pars and Part is the result of the difference between "S" and "T", and both are the names of the same people "(Frye, 1963, in trans by Rajabnia, 1344/1965: 79). There are linguistic similarities between ancient Persian and Sogdian language ( Boyce, 1375/1996: 18).

Thus, the Persians are not relative with the Medes and their en-counter with the Medes were in the East, whose traces is evident in mythology which later we come to it in the following.

Parswa is different from Pars, and Cyrus II and the Achaemenids had no connection with Parswa (Frye, *ibid*: 114). The famous Tarn theory in adapting Khwarizmians to Persian Parswa tribes, and that "Elthaim" finding the term "Parsa" in some areas among the tribes of the eastern parts of Iran (Newly, n. d, in trans by sayd sajad, 1381/2002: 140-141) all refer to the kinship of Pars and Part, and that Parsian migration is from the east, and from Khwarizm to Pars. The linguistic and epigraphic similarities also proves it. One thing is clear and it is that the Persians have not reached Pars through the plains of Ilam and also Anshan is in Pars (Cook, *ibid*: 22). In addition to the language similarities acknowledged by many historians, the epic similarities and the central Shah / Rouhani (priest) system in both eastern Kianiān and the southwest Achaemenids signals Pars and Parth / Khwarizmian kinship. Later, along with the eastern myths becoming epic, the characters of Keikhosrow and Fereydun of the eastern Persians were molded on Cyrus and the Ajayid and Afrasiab on the Medes and Astyagh. This sign indicates not only the linguistic/racial kinship of Pars with the Parthians and eastern Iranian, but also their religious / mythological parallelism and their common hostility with the Medes. [29] The hatred and hostility towards the Medes and their religion and culture was in such a certain extent - we will then talk about its reasons – that Cyrus not only united with Sami Babylonians and Armenians against the Medes, but also Eastern Iranians into agreements with Assyria against Medes. Ketsiz and Diodorus Siculus named the Bactrians who helped the Assyrians during the time of encircling Assyrians by the Medes; hence, it connotes their antagonism towards the growing power of the Median (Newly, *ibid*: 126) and Hyrcanians and Parthians also united with Pars in the battle against the Medes (Catsias, cited in Gershevitch, *ibid*: 175).

Another argument, i.e. the hypothesis of the Parsian migration from the Medes and Median Parswa to Anshan and then Pars is the belief in the existence of the two kingdom Persian families, one in Anshan and the other in Pars. The hypothesis of the existence of two Persian royal families is not compatible with the absolute tyranny of the Persian kings and the monopoly of the empire; thus, it is quite baseless, and it is the construction of Darius's schemes to legitimize himself and to conceal himself being usurper. "The theory that Cyrus is the heir of Anshan and Ariaremane is the inheritor of Parsa, is unacceptable, because Anshan and Parsa are the names of a region." (Yamauchi, *ibid*: 69) "The theory of the existence of two simultaneous Achaemenid monarchies can not be defended. He intercepts recounting his ancestors with "Chesh Pesh" in his command in Babylon and does not mention Achaemenid " (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 130). Nilander proved that Ancient Persian writings in Pasargad had been carried out under the command of Darius, who introduced Cyrus as the king of Achaemenid (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 131). Two tablets discovered in Ekbatan under the names of "Arsham" and "Ariarman" and assumed to be the Darius ancestors have been known ancient forgeries. The two tablets were fake and there only existed one Achaemenid family, that is, Cyrus' ancestors, and Darius did not have any superiority over six other conspirators ... "(Cook, *ibid*: 247). This was also obvious in the horse story and numerous rebellions against Darius. This means that if Darius had not had predetermined priority and legitimacy over the six other nobles, he would not have come from the royal family. When Darius came to throne, Ershame and Wistasp were still alive; however, there is no document of their rule in Pars.

Therefore, there did not exist any racial / linguistic, and even riteous/ religious kinship between the Medes and the Persians, and the Persians migrated not to Med, and not from Mede, but from the East to Persia, but also Persians basically defined themselves in contrast to the Medes" (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 13), there had been a harsh indignation between the Medes and the Persians (Widengren, 1968, in trans by Farhang, 1377/1998: 202). The basis of the Persian Empire was formed not only on the basis of the capture and looting and enslavement of the Medes, but also went too far so that Cyrus introduced the Medes as an unpopular, evil, dragon, etc conspiring with Zoroaster and the priests of other religions. They confiscated all the Median ceremonies and rites and gave them an Iranian content. They disarmed Medes not only in military aspect but also in terms of national culture.

#### The negation of the Median being of Cyrus

Writings all over the world have considered Cyrus as Mandana's son and Astyagh's daughter, which is impossible. (Hinz, 1978/2008, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 92). Cyrus was born several years before the Astyagh sat in the throne in 590 BC (Shahbazi, 1350/1971; 103). When Astyagh replaced the previous king in 584, Cyrus was 17 years old at that time. According to Dinon and Yustinos and Daniel the Prophet, when he conquered Babylon, he was 62 years old. (Hinz, *ibid*: 93). If we less 62 years from the anniversary of the conquest of Babylon in 529 BC, it will become about 590-591BC when it is just a few years before the Astyagh sat on the throne. Nevertheless, the narrations considers Astyagh as the king of Mede who has a virgin daughter. Since Astiagh's daughter sees a bad dream signifying losing the kingdom, he gives his daughter to Cambujia the father of Cyrus 31. According to these narratives, Cyrus must have been born at the time of the Astyage when the narrations do not approve it as he was born in 591 before the Astyagh becoming king. "Thus, the story of the princess Mandana and her giving birth to Cyrus ... is a myth ... Cyrus' mother was not a Median ... this narration has a political root for reconciling the Medes with the Persians" (Hinz, *ibid*: 93). In order to justify Cyrus's rebellion against the Medes and to give the legitimacy to their domination on the Medians, Cyrus, who was alien to the Medes, became the nephew of the Medes in the legends (Freud, 1348/1969: 7). These "myths probably came to Herodotus from the Harpag's family, because Harpag was a wise and innocent man in this myth and Ishtyago was a selfish and tyrannical ruler" (Nöldeke, n. d, cited in Shahbazi, *ibid*: 64).

The fact of the story, as Katzas has pointed out, is that Astyagh had a girl named Amonitis-Mandana-, who married "Spithomas. After the capture of Mede by Cyrus, Cyrus killed Spitamos and he married his wife, who, according to the legendary narration was Cyrus' mother (Ctesias, cited in Briant, *ibid*: 80) 32.

Since in the kingdom of Mad, in the absence of a son, the throne was brought to the groom, Cyrus claimed the reign of the Mede by killing Aspithomas, Astiages' bridegroom and getting his wife. It is likely that Bardia, who revived the Median rebellion against the Persians, would have been the same as the Amothis. We will return to this subject in the next chapter, here we only point out that after the Bardia's death, whom Catias calls "Tanyoukharks", Amonits got aware of this incident and cursed Cambujia and committed suicide by poisoning (Photius, n. d., in trans by Khalili, 1379/2000: 48) Therefore, the possibility of the correctness of the story of Katzias is much greater than that of Herodotus and Xenophon. As Cyrus did not marry Astiagh's

daughter with consent to and consolation but via the killing her spouse and through force, he captured the Medes through violence not with consent. Killing Aspithomas home and putting his hands on his wife Mvtys capture is a symbol of killing the head of the Medes house, Astyag, and conquering her family, i.e. Medes' land.

In the previous materials, we have stated that the Medes and Persians have no racial / linguistic links, etc., and the Medes are the native and the racial / linguistic outcome of the ancient Gothic / Caspian / Huri and ... not migrant Aryans, we denied the kinship of the Medes and Persians and Median being of Cyrus. We proved that the first Iranian / Achaemenid empire was not only based on the collaboration of the Medes, but on the basis of the negation and destruction of the Medes. We will state socially, politically, culturally, and religiously, and ... that the foundation of the Persian / Persian Empire evolved based on the negation and nonfulfillment of the Medes (the Kurds). Firstly, we will survey on Iranian political intellect in contrast to the Median social / political structure socially and politically. Then, we will state that the foundations of Zoroastrianism and Persian mythology were developed on the basis of the negation and constructing the other out of Medes religion. Then we will examine these historical facts, even in Iranian symbols and totems, and the ancient symbols of Persepolis and Pasargadae.

## 2 The social order of Iran in contrast to the social order of Kurd

(Class justice in the conflict with equality justice)

We have already said that the history of Kurd dates back to 3,000 BC. in Zagros region and Kurdistan and various names have been given to the ethnic group of Kurd. It was due to this fact that Kurds themselves did not have a comprehensive government, inscriptions and writing, were named under a special title by others each time, or whenever a Kurd tribe has dominated, they have termed the entire region in the name of that tribe. The names of Guti, Kurti, Karadak, Kordokhi, Kardvin, Caspi, Lolubi, Huri, Mehri, Maran, Mede and ... have all been the different names of a common people. In the Middle Ages, we encounter less the common name of Kurd, and more often the Kurdish tribes such as Shedadai, Rawadi, Ayoubi, Khoramdini, and ... during the Safavid period, the various names like Baban, Betlies, Arda-lan, etc., in contemporary Barzani, Talabani, Kermanaj, Mokriyan and ... signified Kurds 33. As now the word of Kurd is used in general for all the Kurdish tribes, in the ancient times, the term Gothi generally referred to Manna, Mede and ... (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 103).

First of all, we need to explain that when we interpret Kurds quest for identity as based on equality justice and anti-classism, it does not mean that there was no social / class division and inequality among the Medes. It is natural that in all societies there is inequality and different classes. We mean what had hegemony among the Medes and political struggles were formed under its framework. That is, the Median state, did not rely on the aristocracy and hierarchy,

but it relied on the general public against the nobility. Because of this, the aristocrats turned away from the Astyagh.

Therefore, when we speak of the structure of equality and socialist justice in the median community against class justice and the hierarchy of the Persian community, we do not mean that the Median community was utopian and there was no injustice and inequality in it or, on the contrary, there did not exist equality and justice in the Persian community. More than this, our discussion is about the foundations and basis of these two societies / governments. "Georges Domjil" describes the class structure of Indian and Iranian Aryan communities as realized in their religious / mythological consciousness structure which is divided into three clerical, military and farmer classes in both the religious and social forms. "Shaul Shacket" writes that the concept of social classes has a hierarchy in terms of religious knowledge. The survivor is obedient to the divine / religious order and the guilty person is the one who does not obey religious orders. In Zoroastrian religious knowledge, like the social classes (clerics, military, farmers, and the king at the top), people were also divided into three categories of Gahanik, Hadg, Dudig ... People, in Mezdayasnian religion, are divided into three classes: the Gahans who have more knowledge and Minowi action, Dad who have world knowledge and the act and Hedig Manseric who is in the middle of two previous ones. (Shaked, 1995, in trans by Saqibfar, 1381/2002: 20-25). We mean that there has been division of society into classes in reality in the Media; however, there have been two fundamental differences with the Persian society. Firstly, it has not taken a holy and value aspect in media so that to be realized in its political and religious culture and also remain in the domination of the truth; secondly, the Median state was based not on the aristocratic classes but on the masses of the peasantries.

#### Gothian and Mannayas:

Cason considered a bronze statue belonging to one of the Guti kings found in Hamadan and taken to the New York Gallery's Bremer Museum as having species of Zagros Kurds via anthropological comparison and the one on Sheikhan-Tadoni cliff is also the same. "The Azerbaijanian "Emi Tip" in Shohsheh region is in line with this statue and corresponds to the Zagros Mountainous people (Ziapour, *ibid*: 101).

In the 23rd century BC, Gothian defeated Akadians and their king "Naram-Suen" (Diakonoff, 1985, in trans by Keshavarz, 1379/2000: 107), and dominated Mesopotamia. Ottokhgal, "The king of Uruk, called Gutayan" as mountain biting snakes and trepassors of "the gods" realm in his inscription (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 108). Gothic kings are portrayed as scary monster in the myths (34). The tribes of Guitom have been introduced as wild and irrational who lacked the ability to set up the true and noble Kingdom (Cameron, 1936, in trans by Anosha, 1987/2008: 37). Mesopotamia has been invaded by many other ethnic groups and tribes, but why have the Goths - and then Medes - been described as biting snakes, wild, uncanny and trepassors of "the gods" territory and in contrast, why was Cyrus introduced as the Savior by Mardok? The inscriptions somewhat clarify the reasons and they expressed some reasons behind the hatred from the Gwtian: one is that Gwtian turned against the goddesses (Cameron, *ibid*: 37). Diakonove, in addressing to Gutién "Who was the king and who was not" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 107), has analyzed this issue well. He believed that this point that Gotis spreaded hostility and oppression in the

country meant that they evoked a class against another and Gutayans became the leader of the oppressed masses lords (Diakonoff, cited in Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1988/2009: 271) 34. In his viewpoint, Guttians were living in an elementary agricultural period and at the time of Madrasalari. The list of names of Guti kings has two qualities that distinguishes them from others: the brief period of the reign and that there is an explanation before the start of the list in this way: "the Gothian tribe did not have a king"; nonetheless, the list of the kings names has just come. Why did the inscription, on one hand, say that Gottian did not have a king, and on the other hand, it counted the names of the Gothic kings, and how can the short period of the reign of the Guantan kings be justified?

Contrary to the viewpoint of the Western scholars who considered Gutians as frequently busy involved in domestic wars, Diakonov posed this question "how they reigned over an advanced country during 91 years? Beyond these, "W. K. Shilico "has proven that the ruling of Gotyana has been well-established and there has been peace throughout the country. Thus, we can not relate short period of monarchy to waging civil wars. This short term has been perfectly ordinarily, usually for three or six years, it is assumed that the Guate's kings were chosen for a certain period (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 105).

It has been said that Gottian did not have a king; however, it really did not mean the absence of the king and order. The metaphysical and hierarchical culture of Babylon, like Iran, Egypt and Assyria, sees the earthly and political order as the continuation of the metaphysical / cosmic order. There, the king should have a goddesslike glory who should have been chosen by the gods rather than the people. For this reason, Gottian, who had a ground/ contract order influenced by the Mehr religion that meant treaties and contracts - this will be discussed later – and also there the kings who did not have metaphysical sanctity and were chosen by people or tribal chiefs have been titled as irrational, biting snake, aggressive to gods and disordered from the point of view of metaphysical cultures such as Babylon. In same way, as the Medes later who elected Diaaco were called Ajayadak Ahriman / Devel in the Iranian / Zoroastrian metaphysical culture. For this reason, Hobbes, who again returned to the social contract theory against the divine right of the kings, named his book and his government as Leviathan / Ahriman.

Some scholars regard Tartoni and Zahab inscription as belonging to the Gothic and Lolubi Shahs where the Shah has been placed in front of a goddess and has gotten the ring of power / legitimacy from him and he has put his enemies under his feet. It is similar to Darius Bistoon inscription which it is probably Darius's pattern in engraving Bistoon inscription. But, as Herzfeld and following him Vishil and Diakonov have proved, these inscriptions belong to Akadi kings in the Kurdistan region. "The inscription is written in Akkadian and language and its style and time are consistent with the style of the Akkad statues and all are in the era of a king called Naram Sin who had a monarchy in Akkad. It appears from the stone plate belonging to Akkad king at the Laura Museum and Sarapul pictograph is the same king himself (Naram Sin, Ghaderi). Because that king has conquered the land of Lula (Sar-i-Pul) ... this conquest occurred around 2550-2670 BC. "(Herzfeld, 1936, in trans by Hekmat, 1354/1975: 18-19). The third pictograph in Sarapul shows the Anoban king in front of the goddess alone. It is likely that this Anoban king is not only the hero of old Akad but he has also given his name to that land. The dress and all designs in Sarpul and ... are Sumerian dresses too (Herzfeld, *ibid*: 20).

Consequently, the inscription of the Tranny and Anobani inscriptions that are mistakenly considered to be the kings of Guti and Lolubi belongs to the Akkadian conquerors in the region, which after the conquest of the Goths, have left these inscriptions in honor of their triumphs and their gods. It is like the inscription of Darius in Bistoon, which is also in the Median land; however, there is no reason to consider it as belonging to the Medes. Darius, after de-feating Geomatia and Median Farhuratesh, has carved the inscription of Bistoon in which he takes the ring of power and legitimacy from Ahuramazd in honor of his victory on the Medes. The enemies under the feet of Dariush and Shah-e Anobanini are Goths / Medes and not those who have metaphysical / heavenly legitimacy and take the ring of power and legitimacy from Ahura Mazda / Marduk. These inscriptions and the culture realized in them who have no similarities (commonalities) with to the Gwtian who had chosen kings and the Medes who had come to power through the social contract. It is unlikely that whatever archaeological excavations have discovered on the territory of the Medes to be belonging to the Median culture (Genito, 1986; Kuhrt, 2010: 19)

This contractual / selective and political culture and the participation of freemen were also observed in Mannayas who were also a part of the Gothic (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 93; Aliev, *ibid*: 291). The land of Mannae, unlike other eastern countries, continued to play an active role in Social life. The king of Manna did not manage the affairs of state via "tyranny of vote" and was not actively involved in every affair, but the eldest council limited his power; a Assyrian text says that the king of Mana was accompanied by the elders and advisers and ... "(Diakonoff, *ibid*: 95). Unlike the other eastern countries, the people of Manna rebelled against one of their kings which was unsurpassed in the history of the East ... the rebellion against the oppressor signalled a public internal co-operation that other nations lacked it due to the conditions of the eastern slavery community. "(Diakonov, *ibid*: 166). The economic condition of Manna suggests the presence of large groups of freemen and slaves, and ordinary free people played a big role in political life of Mana state (Ivanov, et al, 1965, in trans by Izadi and Tahvili, 1359/1980: 54).

#### - The Social Order of the Medes:

The Median era is the darkest time of the history. The lack of the inscriptions and resources have made many historians - Girshman, Aliyev, Diakonov - understand the Median structure in comparison to Assyria and Persia. They were unaware that the Median contradiction with the rest was not only ethnic / tribal, but also structural / cultural. We should, according to Waters, seriously review the traditional views of the scholars who analyzed Medes in the interval between the Assyrian period and the emergence of Pars as in the continuation of the eastern empires as, according to the Assyrian and Babylonian sources, we are faced with a multitude of kings not just one king in Mede (Waters, 2011: 243). All this hatred for the Medes in the mythology of nations is rooted in social structure and Median culture. "The critique of the sky must be turned into a critique of the earth." Satan and Zahaak are rooted in politics and politics is rooted in the social structure of equality and the convention of the Mede. The conceptual analysis of the Mede society requires a courage that may be the same as stupidity and beyond the speculations. However, since the analogy of the Median with Assyria and Persia is also, according to Grishman, speculation, we inevitably have to estimate and guess based on the minimum resources and the analysis we will give below is not something sacred. It is

just the conceptual analysis that constructs concepts, not the description. There will certainly be contradictions between details and facts in our analysis. But we will abstract whatever had hegemony in the framework of concept. We deal with concepts and generalities, not the scattered details, which there exist definitely a lot of contradictions for them. The entire ancient history has been reconstructed according to mere speculation. The principle of science is the same too, conceptualizing and rejecting it. Our conceptualization also provides an angle or a new attitude to history and also a background for further critique and, ultimately, for the annulment of our theory.

Since the Kurds (the Medes) have been described in all Sami / Iranian and Jewish / Greek myths with the common and evil concepts, they must have had a difference with the rest of all nations, and this difference is not in the concepts of Satan, Ajaydak, Medusa, and ... themselves. It would seem that there was a difference in the social / political structure and culture and the Median government with other nations that have been all described with common cursed concepts. Sami, Persia, Judaism and Greek cultures are Religious / Apollonian and they are based on hierarchical justice (Platonism), heavenly legitimacy and metaphysical culture. In all of these cultures, the Kurds (the Medes) have been described as "the other" of these metaphysical cultures. Can there be inferred concepts that contradict the political wisdom of these nations, such as shared justice, earthly/dionizional cultures and earthly / contract legitimacy?

The Median government was founded on the bases of the social contract and the kings having equal rights <sup>35</sup> to repatriate the foreign enemy (Assyria) and to arbitrate and enforce domestic justice. It was promoted to the level of a powerful empire by leading Hawksheshtera. After capturing the Assyria and conquering up to the border of Leeds, the Medes certainly achieved a lot of possessions like the other conquering empires. The flood of all these possessions and riches caused a class breakup and a gap between the aristocrats and military forces and the public. But, there were two important differences between the Medes and the other eastern empires. One is that the foundation of the Median state was not based on the hierarchy and divine rights of the kings, but rather on the agreemental democracy based on the choice and people's acceptance - not in its current sense. Its purpose was not to take over other states and plunder,

Unlike Iran and Islam <sup>36</sup>, its goal was domestic justice and repelling the assault of others. The conquest of Assyria was also due to the 700-year-old Assyrian incursions into the land of Mada; the only solution to repel it was the same assault and destruction of the Assyrian empire, which was basically was founded on looting and imperialism. Another difference was that the military forces were separated from the general population due to obtaining possessions in other empires and they were considered a distinct and aristocratic class, but the military forces were not a certain separate class, but they included free people and the general public. The reason for the correctness of our claim is clearly evident in Darius's writing in Bistoon inscription, which Diakonov and Aliyev have also accepted it.

Darius the first made a distinction between "the people – the brave men who were with me" and "the Median warriors who were in the congregations" (cited in Diakonoff, *ibid*: 307). The warrior people – Kare - were all free inhabitants of the land of the Media and the main masses who were the free farmer people. Thus, it was in contrary to "long-living ten thousand people"



in the Pars Corps who Daruis led them during Cambyses' invasion of Egypt Darius. We will focus on this matter in more detail in discussing the Median state.

As we have said, conquering the Assyria has definitely had a lot of gains for the Medes. But as it was mentioned above, firstly, the military men were the same ordinary people and liberals of the community. Therefore, the military men being rich was the richness of the entire Median and liberal society, not the aristocrats and the certain class of people. Secondly, the structure of the Median society / state, unlike Achaemenid, was not based on aristocracy, but on common people and tribal democracy. If there had been an aristocratic class and it had owned a lot of wealth - which was also the case - it would have been unaccustomed to the Median society, not something common to it. We can prove the accuracy of our argument by saying that the betrayal of the aristocrats under the leadership of Harpag and Moghan, both to the Median community and to the king and supporting foreign king caused a general unity and solidarity of the people and liberals with Astyagh King that showed the resistance of "All Medes from Old and Young" for three years against Cyrus (Herodotus, 1987, in trans by Mazandarani, 1384/2005: 101) indicating freemen's support for Astyagh.

If the foundation of the Median society / state and its kingdom was based on aristocracy and plundering war gains, it would certainly be the common and free people who would betray or revolt against the king and the nobles, not the nobles and Mogs against the king and the group of freemen. Therefore, when we speak of the structure of equality and justice of the Median community versus the class and hierarchical justice of the Iranian society, we do not mean that the Median community has been utopia, but the issue is about the foundations of these two societies / states. The Achaemenid / Iranian society / Achaemenid state was developed based on the aristocracy and the heavenly legitimacy of plundering, and the foundation of Median society / state was developed on the bases of democracy, popular acceptance, and defense and justice. "The Median kingdom was established in confrontation with aristocrats firm defense and the Median kings were reliant on the masses of the free people" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 256). The conflict between the military and tribal elders (wealthy aristocrats) and the kingdom who pursued the progressive policy of unity of the country ... that relied on the broader sections of freedom intensified more and more and it destroyed the Median government during the reign of the next king (Astyag) ... " (*ibid*: 310). The Median king could exist only on the condition of fighting against the elders and relying on the general freemen (*ibid*: 385). However, in Media a wealthy class of aristocrats came into the existence with the conquest of Assyria and ...and the bounty of war gains and wealth... but the available sources of information do not indicate the division of society into military, religious and ... classes such as the society of Avestan Indian and Sassanian Iran ... "(Diakonoff, cited in Gershevitch, 1985, in trans by Shalgoni, 1387/2008: 163). We do not have any information of the Achaemenids slaves in agricultural work and family in Mede (*ibid*: 164). If there had been a slavery, it would not have exceeded domestic slavery. The main producers were the free inhabitants, each of whom was also a warrior, and this was the secret behind the Median's success (Aliev, *ibid*: 397). It can be deduced from Herodotus words that Astyag had slaves as it is seen in this phrase: "Mytrydat the shepherd of King's herds"; nonetheless, Herodotus' words imply that the slaves were not different from the free people. The slaves used to be the shepherds and had the right to form a family. Ctesias also speaks of a particular type of pseudo-slavery which had no particular difference with child abduction. There was a non-written law for the poor under the support of a rich man in which the miserable would have to serve the rich as long as he supplied him with

food and clothing (Aliff, *ibid*: 416). What is inferred from the connotations of Kattis and Herodotus words is that it was not really slavery, It was the opposite of slavery. Where the slave has the right to leave the slavery in the absence of provision and then to change his master. The lords had the right to change the slaves, but in no place in the world from Rome to Egypt, no slaves, as its name suggests, had no right to protest and no right to access food and clothing. Herodotus also pointed out that a Median nobleman could play with the child of a slave in equal conditions (Herodotus, cited in Diakonoff, *ibid*: 163). Although the Mitradas has a symbolic meaning and it is derived from Mithra, it is possible that it denoted a treaty and an agreement that is the guardian of the people and I will deal with it later in the discussion about Mithra.

Herodotus, who says that Astiag was brutal with the Medians, but he immediately clarified that he meant that he was the nobles of Mede. Therefore, "the king, Astyag, should have ... a kind of social support like that of the masses of peasants in case of fighting against aristocracy" (*ibid*: 171-172). As the King did not make the aristocrats richer from conquests, they turned against him (Herodotus, cited in Diakonoff, *ibid*: 171). In Median socie-ty/government, members of the communes and the king were united against the aristocrats and Moghan, and Moghan, along with the aristocrats, had a political role (Ivanov, *ibid*: 69). The Median kingdom, which relied on the freemen and the masses of people, was as much against nobles as was also not in a good relationship with Mogies. Mogies also, were involved in the betrayal to Median king as much as the aristocrats. At the same time, Moges persuaded Asatiag to flee Cyrus, and as the result, Astyag captured Mogies punished them severely (Herodotus, *ibid*: 101). Aaristocratic nature of the clerics (Moges) could not suit the democratic nature of Median kingdom" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 174). Moghan, along with aristocrats got in touch with the insurgents and Persians; thus, the Mages recieved a special respect in the court of Cyrus and Cambujia" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 175).

Aristocrats and Moges, who later betrayed Medians and joined Cyrus, attributed the story of oppression, cruelty, and making the others eat the flesh of the children to Astyag just to justify their betrayal. While Herodot's story of feeding the flesh of the children to Harpag is legendary, Herodotus himself, who says that Astyag chose Harpag to command the army in the war against Cyrus, repudates this story. Herodotus took the information from the descendants of Harpag ... "(Diakonoff, *ibid*: 171-172). Herodotus and Katzys have quoted that Harpag had set up the ground for a conspiracy before Persian rebellion against the Medes, and he gave Cyrus the words of Median nobles to support him (Herodotus, *ibid*: 98; Diakonoff, *ibid*: 387) 38. The same conspiracy of the two groups of aristocrats and Moghan, on the one hand, and the influx of Iranian / Persian Cyrus led to the final collapse of the Median state on the other hand. Until the fall of the Medes even shortly afterwards, the free citizens were the most important factor in the median society and were the main core of their blessings and the main force of their army (Aliev, *ibid*: 406) but gradually the class culture that infiltrated into the Mede from the advanced countries destroyed quickly whatsoever the Mede government was constructd on (*ibid*: 405). Two groups of aristocrats and clergymen (Moghan) were able to survive with the blood of gains and property that had flowed in their veins was in all ancient societies. In Mede, cutting off this blood flow that took the breath out of them sought support from Persian Cyrus to make a deal with him and later formed the main foun-dations of the Achaemenid / Persian government. In fact, the two groups of aristocrats and Moghan who betrayed the Medes and caused the final collapse of the Median state / society, were turned into the main pillars of the Persian / Iranian state / Persian society from the Achaemenids to the Sasanians, that is, what led to the decline

of the Medes became the agent of the emergence and formation of the Parsian government. It was the unity of the two groups of aristocrats and clergymen (Moghan), which led to the collapse of other Kurdish movements from Gomatha and Farhurtish to Mazdak and Kharadminan. If the class culture, as some of the historians have pointed it out, led to the fall and decline of the Median government/society, it was the advent of folks' culture and Islamic democracy that were the main factors behind the downfall and decline of Iran in Sasanian era, as some other historians have referred to it (Girshman, 1976, in trans by Moin, 1388/2009: 430), i.e. the factors causing the Kurd (from the Gothic era and the Middle to the Khartoum period) to decline have led to the persistence of the Persians. The communist and anti-class structure of the Kurds, which began with the Goths and was reproduced with the Medes, Gomatha, Mazdak, and Kharadminan, in opposition to the aristocratic and classical structure of Iran, which began with the Achaemenids against the Medes, and was reconstructed with Darius against the Gutians, Anoushirvan versus Mazdak, Afshin and Taherian versus Khorram Dinar 41.

- Achaemenids/Persians social order:

The Persians were the Aryan immigrants who, according to some historians 42, came from the Caucasus to the Zagros and from Zagros to Elam (Anshan) and then to the present Persia. Some other historians 43 deny the migration of the Persians from the land of the Medes (Zagros) and are in favor of their migration from the East to Persia. In our view, the hypothesis of Persian immigration from the Caucasus and Media to Persia cannot be defended and the hypothesis of immigration from the east is more correct, as we have already discussed it. Persians 668 settled in Pars around 670 AH. M almost in the time of Assur Bonai Pal- 633- 668 and Kourosh II became the king of the Iranian tribes about 558 AH. M, whom Pasargados tribe were leading other tribes (Dandamayev, 1963, in trans by Roohi Arbab, 1373/1994: 136). At the beginning of his reign, Cyrus II (the Great) was dependent on the king of Mede –Astiag-, but later he revolted against him. As the news of Nabonid - Cyrus and the inscriptions of Nabonid and the ancient Greek authors testify it In 550 BC, he defeated Medes after three years of struggle, and he captured Astyagh and seized the treasures of the Ekbatan palaces, and took with him to Iran. Since that time, Iran has entered the world of history from the deepest darkness of history (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 137).

Cyrus managed to occupy Mede in collaboration with Babylon, Armenians, and Eastern Iranians, and along with the aristocratic / moghan infiltrators in Mede led by Harpag, but what was the cause of Cyrus's greed for the occupation of Mede? Apparently, the reason for this was that the Persians were burning in the greed for the riches of the Medes (Briant, 2002, in trans by Ferrogan, 1387/ 2008: 23). In order to understand this point fully, we would read the following quotation from the father of historians: "Cyrus was thinking about how to make Iranians riot. After a great deal of thought, he made ready a group of Iranians and read a ...in which Astiag appointed him their commander and said that in this case I will tell you to go and bring your own sickle each one... Cyrus ordered each one to clean up a piece of land full of thorns before sunset ... The next day, Cyrus beheaded all his father's flocks and cattle including sheep and cows, and provided them with a feast to all the soldiers along with having wine and fun (emphasis is mine - Qaderi). ... At the end of the party, he asked them which one you would rather welcome more. They replied: "The difference between the two was so much,

yesterday that we had a hard time, and today it was all fun." Cyrus explained his logic explicitly and said your situation is this now if you listen to my word, you will enjoy the blessings and the thousands of other pleasures and you would never suffer pain and slavery. If you do not listen, prepare yourself for the suffering and abundance of labor like yesterday. I have the duty to liberate you from behalf of the God (emphasis is mine, Qaderi). You are not inferior than the Medes at all; therefore, rebel immediately against the Astyagh (emphasis is mine, Qaderi) (Herodotus, *ibid*: 100 – 99).

There are a few important points in this speech: that the foundation of rebellion and the Persian Empire war against the Medes has been their thirst for authority and the wealth of the Medes. Second, Cyrus knows himself as the messenger of God. Third, and more importantly, the forum that Cyrus was addressing has been the army personels and probably the noblemen. We will deal with the first and second cases later, and now we will focus on the third case, i.e. the base of the Achaemenid Empire, which was aristocrats and army. Since the Persian Cyrus soldiers were the same warriors who rebelled against Median, and perhaps Kare (in Darius inscription) denoted the same people (Frye, 1963, in trans by Rajabnia, 1344/1965: 176). The foundation of the Persian Empire and the Persian rebellion was not common folks and rebellion against oppression, but it was aristocrats and the thirst and plunder of others' wealth with aggression and oppression. This was not a rebellion, but a conquest via war and plunder, and the construction of the Persian Empire was based on militarism, conquest and plundering from the beginning, that is, the same plundering armies that would turn into the aristocrats and the superior class of society.

Herodotus attributes the great privilege of the seven great and influential tribes and their establishment to Darius after the fall of the Geomatia-Samaridis - (Herodotus, *ibid*:232-242; Dandamayev, *ibid*: 224). However, as many scholars have pointed out this is related to Cyrus the second. (Dunker, 1867: 811; Flog1, 1881: 13; Prasek, 1906: 204; Dandamayev, *ibid*: 22; Wiesehofer, 1978, in trans by Sedigh, 1389/2010: 70).

There were some compromises between Cyrus and nobles involving these conditions that Cyrus would become a King and the privileges of that special class would be preserved 44. Cyrus himself was one of the tribal princes and the representative of the tribes because the Achaemenid dynasty was one of the seven famous tribes. (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 225– 226). One of the main conditions of nobles and Cyrus accord was Cyrus' continuous squadrons. He started the base of his empire with raging war on Mede, and he was killed while attacking Massages, he was constantly engaged in the war and the plunder of other nations. While the basis of the Medes' squadrons, according to Griesman, was to conquer territories where they themselves lived on, specifically, their wars were for the liberation of their own lands, not the conquest of others. The Median kingdom relied on the masses of people against the aristocracy, but - according to Xenophon - Cyrus often distinguished the common people from the nobles; in the Cyrus Corps, the peoples lived their lives without doing any work, because they earned their living on the work of others (Xenophon, book 8, seasons 1, paragraph 16, cited in Briant, *ibid*: 520).

The policy of founding the empire was compatible with the intentions of the tribal nobles (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 70). Cyrus and the aristocrats intended to conquer lands for the sake of gains

(Rezaei, 1384/2005: 309), as the warfare gains were poured into aristocrats' pockets. Sending the masses of people and captives of other nations, Shah (King), Moghan and the Persian aristocrats enjoyed its concessions and they were exempt from taxes. After killing the Median Geumata, all the nations of Asia cried for him except the Persians (Herodotus, *ibid*: 224). Guamata, who exempted them from three years recruitment and paying taxes, clashed with the arrogance and conspiracy of the aristocrats. Forgiving the taxpayment and recruitment for three years meant the termination of the Persian aristocracy, and the ending of the superiority of the Persians against other nations under their domination. As Herodotus remarked, the Persians have gained all the great riches as the result of looting; thus, they were not able to restrict themselves to any limitations (Wiesehofer, *ibid*: 71). At the time of Cyrus, all the countries, regarded to be the whole universe were conquered in the hands of Cyrus, and the share of Cambujes was only the conquest of Egypt. For this reason, with the end of the conquests and the disruption of the blood of the aristocratic gains, the contradiction developed between the nobles and Cambyases. The secret behind this point that Cyrus is introduced as a kind king and the father (VII, 2.) (Cameron, 1955: 81-86) and Cambyases, as a dangerous and crazy man (Herodotus, *ibid*: 210, Shwenzner, 1921: 84). The story of Herodotus, which Cameron described as the goodness of Cyrus and Zener as the madness of Cambyases was also taken from a source of Iranian news (Dandamayev, *ibid*: 227). The same aristocrats were Iranian news source (Dandamayev, *ibid*), which Cambujias policies were not in line with the benefit of their plundering which was the source of Herodotus' information calling Asty-agh and the Medes as evil, with the difference that the anti-noble policies of Cambyases were in the direction of the concentration of power (Dandamayev, *ibid*) and tyranny. The anti-noble policies of Astyag-Geumata were in line with the public and masses of the people. The Iranian/Achaemenid Empire has been reflected in the narration of the Xenophon 45 and even the Iranian mythology 46.

Therefore, unlike the Median state / society, the Cyrus / Iranian empire system established based on aristocracy and hierarchical justice. "The high aristocrats of Persia cooperated with Cyrus, and Cyrus was also received them with open arms" (Cook, 1383: 106). This aristocratic/hierarchical structure (Platonic justice) which resulted in the fall of the Medes and the founding of Achaemenid, It faced challenges, according to Wieschofr, from Media Geumata who was the predecessor of Mazdak; these challenges were the elements of socialist justice and anti-aristocracy, anti-religious, median and anti-Persian, tax exemption, recourse, etc., and again they were reproduced by Darius. In Sasanians time along with the Kurdish revolt of Mazdak - we will come to it later - with the same characteristics of shared justice, freedom of Eros and ... the foundation of the Sassanid civilization, which was destroyed by the unification of aristocrats and Moghan by Anoushirvan and the aristocratic / hierarchical system of Iran again Resumed.

### 3. The Median state against the Iranian government: the contract against the divine right -

The Median government:

In the previous discussions, I remarked some points: We denied the race / language kinship of the two tribes of Mede and Pars. Medes are the Indigenous people of the region and a tribal outcome of Gothic, Caspian, and ... people who were perpetual residents of this land. However,

Persians are the migrators and Aryans who migrated to Persia from the south of Russia steppes in eastern course. Then we questioned the mythical but baseless hypothesis of the Median being of Cyrus rooted in the myth of Keykhosrow, whose mother Farangis was the daughter of Afrasiab, the King (Shah) of Turanian. Subsequently, his character and biography modeled on Cyrus. Later, we challenged the prevailing, but unwarranted, hypotheses of the shared dominance of Med / Pars, and that Cyrus had mastered the Medes through the Medes own wish. In terms of social / class structure, we proved the difference between the two Persian and Median systems with material, and now we will distinguish between the Persian / Achaemenid state / empire and the material state, in order to show baseless being of this pre-vailing assumption that the Achaemenid empire was in the continuation of the system of Median state. In fact, the formation of the Iranian government / empire was not a continuation of the state / kingdom of Median, but it developed in the breakdown, negation, and the construction of "the other" for it. In the following, we will prove that the political intellectuality of Iranians and their empire system was the reproduction / continuity of the political ration of the Mesopotamian structures (Assyria / Babylon) Egypt and Elam, not Mede.

According to Herzfeld and others, the Median history is the darkest period in the so-called Iranian history. Some scholars deny the existence of ancient artifacts in Med (Genito, 1986: 11). The Medes lacked their own writing language, and probably used the cuneography of the Akad (Schmidt, 2006). Archeological and artistic evidence of the Medes is so much scattered that it is difficult to provide an interpretation of it (Kuhrt, 2010: 19), and we should continue to have archaeological discoveries in order to illuminate the darkness of Median history. Unfortunately, until the fulfillment of those expectations, Median history should be studied based on the evil viewpoints of Mede enemies, i.e. the Assyrians, the Persians and the Babylonians whose inscriptions indicated their own rightfulness and humiliation of the Medes. Even Greek historians – as well as Herodotus- as proved today, have taken their own information from the enemies of Med, the descendents of Harpag and the other seven conspiring aristocratic families conspiring against Geomatia. Some scholars consider the Herodotus writings to be of no importance in correspondence with the Assyrian texts (Helm, 1981: 87). Some others regard them as validators of Herodotus writings (Bivar, 2005: 340-342). Thus, criticizing some of the Herodotus' ideas and giving credits to others does not mean arbitrary use of his viewpoints.

Given that the source of Herodotus information was the opponents of the Medes, one should be more cautious in using the opposing viewpoints than the agree-mental ones. Certainly, the Median oppositions did not say what was in the interest of the Medes and to their own detriment. Of course, it is possible that they did not conceal facts from Herodotus that, in their thoughts, were a source of humiliation, but in the consciousness of modern historiography, they are not humiliation but worthwhile information. One of these facts are the doctrine of arbitration and public choice of Diaco in the formation of a Median state. Even in expressing these facts, the vindictiveness of the Herodotus sources, i.e. the Median oppositions, is well evident 47.

Herodotus writes: " the Medians were scattered in the countryside and did not have any central government; as the result, chaos spreaded throughout that land. Dioux, who was a prominent man in his village, tried to carry out justice among his compatriots with greater zeal and seriousness ... . Since people of that village recognized his grace and perfection, they chose him as the judge of their differences. (Dioux) acquired such a credibility in the eyes of his

compat-riots that he attracted the attention of the people who lived in the neighborhoods ... they were pleased to bring to him their countless contrasts "(Herodotus, *ibid*: 76-77) 48". Therefore, the basis of the Median state is founded on arbitrariness and the need for Judgment (Mirzai, 1379/2000: 233), the popularity and people choice, co-operation and internal security, and finally repelling the foreign enemy (Assyria), not invasion and aggression. Unlike Iranians / Persians, there was no mention of the king's divine right (metaphysical legitimacy), royal race, and the thirst to achieve the wealth of other nations.

After reappointing Diux as the judge, Herodotus writes that: "he (Diox) asked to build a glorious palace deserving his name and give him a personal guard ... he asked them to build a big city ... a city which is now called Ekbatan whose walls are tall, tight, circular and in maze shape ... each of which is wider than the other wall ... the numbers of circles are seven. Each wall was in a special color, the first white and the second black, and ... that they had painted them with an different colors, and the roofs of last two were covered one with silver and the other with gold ... "(Herodotus, *ibid*: 78-79). Herodotus continues, "Dioux separated him-self from people and there laughing and spitting were forbidden in the presence of the king and ... these are special to the great and magnificent kings. Nonetheless, Diox continued to judge justly "(*ibid*: 80) 49. This later description of Herodotus about the seven color palace... can not be accurate." Herodotus's comment on Median kingdom (capital, guard and ...) is similar to the pre-made model of the "first innovator" and the Achaemenid institutions ... And we are tempted to think that Herodotus, like Strabon, has attached what has known about the Persian customs on the reign of the Medes "(Briant, *ibid*: 41). Therefore, Ekbatan, as described by Herodotus, has never existed; these descriptions regarding the colorful walls are similar to those of the legendary city of Gang Dej. Herodotus description of Ekbatan is all myth that Herodotus has considered a historical fact. The description of the Greek historian Plebius is more precise and correct that Ekbatan had no walls had only a solid fortress-es"(Herzfeld, *ibid*: 49-50); the construction of seven houses with strange colors is seen in the very old stories, and it has been reproduced in folklore myths. Herodotus has also used it to describe the Dioux's Palace ... "(Christensen, 1941, in trans by Safa, 1343/1964: 121). "How is it possible to identify something - Ekbatan - in later texts which it belonged to the Median period and the Achaemenid and Greek performed changes in it ...?" (Briant, *ibid*: 130). The fact that Ekbatan has been described after performing the Achaemenid and Greek changes on it can be generalized to the entire Median political culture. Unfortunately, the ancient and modern writers describes the structure of state and political culture of the Medes in analogy with the Achaemenids and the Assyrians eras which should be strictly avoided. In the weakness of information about Medians, the Iranian / Mesopotamian political culture cannot be molded on that country. "Herodotus' words about time and the conditions of the establishment of this norm (the courtiers and the seven-colored palace of the Diako-Qaderi) are in doubt. He has transferred the rules that were known to him at Dariush and Ardeshir's court to the mythical court of Diako ... However, if we attribute the construction of the palace and ... the orders related to King's life to Cyrus' time, it will be more correct ... the rulers of the, undoubtedly, have adapted the rules of the Assyrian - Babylon .... palaces" (Briant, *ibid*: 141).

Herodotus's writings are about the beginning of the formation of the state of the Medes, but if the same popular structure of the Mede state continued after Diox, or tended towards despotism and absolute authority? We have already said that the mass / popular and anti-aristocratic structure of the Median state remained until the last king of the Medes - Atisyag, and Astyag

became the victim of his popular and anti-aristocratic policies. Some scholars are attempting to see the Astyag policies, in contrast to aristocrats, towards centralization and absolute monarchy similar to Cambujia, but the available resources do not show any evidence of the centralization and autocracy of the Median kings. This is also evident from the narrations of the Jewish Prophets, the Assyrian inscriptions - up to the time of Hawxshter - and contemporary scholars.

Jeremiah the prophet in addressing to the Medes: "a great nation and the numerous kings come from the north. God has blessed the spirit of the kings of Mede ... O daughter of Babylon, the rulers of the Medes are the whole of governors (emphasis is mine - Qaderi), and all the people of the world are in his kingdom ... "(Jeremiah the prophet, cited in Aliev, *ibid*: 410 - 411). As it is the case in the word of Jeremiah the prophet, Medes are addressed in the terms of numerous kings, "mede kings", and "the whole of their rulers" at the height of his power after the conquest of Assyria, which posed a threat to the great government of Babylon. If the Mede government was a centralized and despotic system, only a king and a person, and not many kings, etc would be named. The same Jeremiah the Prophet while speaking about the Achaemenids, he did not mention a name of the Achaemenids, nor Persians, nor anyone else, but speaks only about the name of Cyrus. That is, Cyrus has had such a personal centralized system and absolute tyranny as if the whole Persians / Persians ... were diggested in the personality of Cyrus. Again, Jeremiah the prophet Jeremiah, when discussing the Median Kings, he stated the names Ararat-Urartu-Maine-Manna-Scanaz-Scythians - And ... "(*ibid*: 411). Ararat and Manna and ... were under the domination of the Medes at that time which were still independently named. They had retained their identity and the kingdom despite being under the political dominant of the medes. As it was the case with Persians who continued to call themselves kings and to have internal autonomy even after being under the domination of the Medes. That is, in the system of the Medes' state / kingdom, there was no concentration of power, tyranny, hierarchy, unity - not agreement - and ... and there has been, in the language of today, a kind of federalism and unity as plurality or empire. All nations under the domination of the Medes continued to have a kingdom, domestic independence and freedom. "We do not have any information about the sending of a Mede as a satrap (governor) of another country like Persia, Armenians, etc." They had nothing like the concept of the kingdom there in the modern sense that Iranians today consume as Manuel Cook pointed out: "Cyrus appointed his own rulers in the regions conquered. Therefore, he was not the king of the kings like the the real kings of the Medes"(Cook, 1983, in trans by Saqibfar, 1389/2010; 88) 51. Its referent is neither a centralized or hierarchical empire of Iranians, from Achaemenid to Sasanians, which were based on their domination on the other people / the Persians (Briant, *ibid*: 126), but its true referents are the Medes. "Emile Benonist" also linguistically states that the term "Imperi-al" is not Persian, but it is a lending word of the Median language (Benveniste, 1969: 17). Herodotus has also described Mede kingdom as an inept organization (Herodotus, cited in Frye, 1963, in trans by Rajabnia, 1344/1965: 120). Even the domination of the Medes on Central Asia was more like a treaty with local chieftsmen than the formation of an empire (Briant, *ibid*: 35).

Further, the Medes described by the Assyrian inscriptions were 27 independent kings, and there is no document that the internal conditions of the people of the Medes have transformed in the direction of the unification of the tribes around a greater ruler that could be called the king" (Burian, the same, 41). The uprising of the Median was in Nowruz 673 against Assyria, with the leadership of Kheshterita, the lord of Dehkar, Kashi, Mami, Tiarsho, the lord of Wishinde



in the state of Madhya, and Dosanti, the lord of the Deh in the state of Separsa. In this way, the people of the three states got involved in struggles under three equal- right leaders having equal rights 52 "(Diakonoff, *ibid*: 247).

There are clear references in Assyrian texts indicating lack of a centralized Median state "(Volgelsang, 1999: 48). The old Assyrian texts refer to a number of rulers, called "Bilyalani", who ruled in different areas of Mede. The tribe whose head was "Weaspathish", the clan whose chairman was "Zanotopatysh" and the nation, whose chairman was "Hivapathish"; all three also were used to mean human beings and their shelters ... Bilalys in its singular form was the general chief and the highest rank of the rulers ... that they were not given any special title ... because they did not officially recognize the supremacy of a superior tribe over other tribes. This superiority was officially recognized through the marriage of the chiefs ... in Babylonian tradition the person who was the head of the Medes was called the Shah (the king). The nickname of Bilali in singular was not the head of the tribe, nor the chief of the clan, but Hivapathish was the head of the nation" (Herzfeld, 1936, in trans by Hekmat, 1351/1972: 47-49). The "Bilaaliyah" in its plural form referred to the lowest grade of the tribal ranks (the chief of a tribe); however, "Bilalani" in singular form was the general head and "Hivapathish" meant the head of the nation.

That is, "Hivapathish", the head of the nation of the Medes has been as the result of the same accord of the Bila Lani and the entire tribesmen. The Assyrians used Biellaani to refer to the Medes, not to mean the head of the tribe, but the head of the Hivapathish (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 179). The Medes themselves used the Biellaani in singular form to show the highest level of the ruler - the Hivapathish. Thus, the Assyrians who utilized Bale collectively about the Medes and not in addressing to the nomad chiefs denoted the same hivapathish, and the plurality of kings. This is what the Medes would name it multi-kings to mean the diversity and numerosity of the kings. However, the Persian emptied the Median and its Mithraian/accord meanings and gave them Persian Zoroastrian/Geodly meanings, that is, they interpreted fere (very =multi) kings as FereShahi (king's glory) or kings divine sign which we will come to later.

Thus, even at the height of the war with the Assyrians - every nation needs a serious leader and a serious military hierarchy -, the Medes had several leaders with equal ranks. The tyranny that Herodotus refers to is the tightening of the Median leaders against the nobility with the support of the masses of people. "The success of Kheshteriteh uprising depended on the support of the masses of the Mede free people of the Median kings against the tribal aristocrats" (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 256-257). Herodotus, who refers to the tyranny of Darius himself, writes: "Medes had people assemblies and elders councils (Herodotus, cited in Diakonoff, *ibid*: 180). Mede country were composed of autonomous and independent states (Rezaei, 1384: 204) and Median kings were self-decision makers (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 180) since they relied on the masses of free people (Rezaei, *ibid*: 206). All centralized imperialist monarchies of the history have ruled through rigorous tyranny and hierarchy; the notion of a powerful Mede without a hierarchical harsh concentration is difficult for many scholars. Thus, many have casted doubts on a powerful and unified Median kingdom (Strohnach in Curtis, 2005, in trans by Mokher, 1373/1994: 182). They were unaware of the fact that the main force of the Mede was not in concentrated kingdom, but in the participation of the people's power and the agreement of the tribes.

One of the reasons for the lack of tendency towards corruption in the state of the Medes (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 257) was the non-formation of a separate class of military personnels. Darius made a difference between "people - the warrior who were with me" and "the people - the Median warlords who were in the congregations". It means the Median Army was not isolated from the people and consisted of volunteering troops (*ibid*: 182). The formation of military cadres and their leadership lead to the hierarchy of society and the absolute sovereignty of leaders over the masses of the people in many societies. However, in Medes, the king had no monopoly of economy and property, not the monopoly of the army and the military; the army and the military served the society, and the king had no means for absolute power. It was as if the king indicated only symbolic legitimacy and policies. Another reason for the lack of hierarchy and tendency toward tyranny in the Median state is found in the fact that the leader in other eastern societies was from the race of gods or chosen by gods and was of a particular seedlings, and had a divine right to be king not being responsive to people but to God; as his order were from gods, they were absolutely effective. However, in Median state, the basis of the state was founded not on the divine right of the king in the Median state, ... but on the basis of a general vote - not in its current sense - and a social contract – which quite evident from the name of the Hegmataneh, means the place of gathering (Grishman, *ibid*: 116) is well-known) and had no other source of legitimacy other than the people and their will.

#### Iranian Government:

Herodotus's reference to the formation of the Iranian/ Achaemenid Empire pointed out to three important points, one was that Cyrus' address was to encourage Iranians (armies) to invade the Medes (Herodotus, the same, 100). Thus, the General Society that Cyrus called on at the time of the preparation of the rebellion against the Medes to speak against the Medes in front of them were the same armies (Widengren, 1968, in trans by Farhang, 1377/1998: 149). Secondly, Cyrus considered him-self as the envoy from behalf of the god to free the Persians (*ibid*) from the domination of the Medes. The third was that the foundation of the formation of this empire was the war and the thirst for Median wealth (*ibid*). Previously, we discussed the military/aristocracy nature of the Achaemenid /Iranian Empire and its negation of the Medes and its anti-Median being. Now, as we have inferred the basis of the Median state according to Herodotus, we will deal with the other two elements on the bases of this text affecting the structure of the Achaemenid/Iranian Empire. One is the claim of the metaphysical legitimacy and divine right of the first king of Iran and the second is the formation of the kingdom based on aggression to acquire gains and the wealth of the other nations.

As it is clear from the content of Herodotus' book, the basis of the Persian empire under the leadership of Cyrus was founded on the occupation and thirst for wealth and the gains of other lands with the divine right of the kings in contrary to the Medes which the foundation of their government was formed based on the internal consensus and the implementation of justice with the terrestrial/agreemental legitimacy,

The foundation of the Iranian empire, like Islam, was based on the occupation of other lands and the acquisition of gains. As if it is the fate of Iran to occupy and claim others lands from the promises of Cyrus and the Persian spears of Darius, 54 to the "the way of Quds goes through Karbala" each time under different ideologies (Islamic, Ahmadi, Iranian land border, etc). Land

taking was due to the "aristocratic structure of power in Achaemenid Iran (Christiansen, *ibid*: 3) - who were thinking of personal gain and profligacy - and lawlessness in the community that the personal wishes of the king (Shah) were considered absolute law. As the result, all the people of Pars, with the exception of one person (the king), were handfulls of slaves devoiding from the rights of citizenship (Xenophon, cited in Aliev, *ibid*: 321). What the Iranian king wanted from the subordinated people was "to live for the sake of him, to work for him, to fulfill all his requests and to die in his path" (Grishman, cited in Rezaei, 1384/2005: 315). The desire of the absolute ruler of Iran was acquiring the glory of more land taking (Conquest). 56 Cyrus himself always compared the good king with a good shepherd who expects absolute obedience from his serfs (Xenophon, n. d., in trans by Karimi, 1350/1971: 258). The structure of the shepherds / cattle (the lord / the landlord) 57 would make all to be under the pure obedience of the king. "In Iran, all subordinate nations, under the care and control of the king's guardians, would bring the ransom for the king, and the king is the center of life. The Greeks worship the gods and the Iranians pray for a human being that represent God. "(Grishman, 1976, in trans by Mo'in, 1388/2009: 422).

Contrary to Dioux, Cyrus did not get his legitimacy from the public choice, but he regarded himself as being sent from behalf of God, and his (the Cyrus) first thought was from the gods and making sacrifice for them, (Xenophon, cited in Briant, *ibid*: 372). He determined the first and the greatest assignment as the worship of the gods (Xenophon, cited in Farshad-Mehr, 1385/2006: 64). From the very beginning of the formation of his empire, he emphasized on his divine right and metaphysical legitimacies. "The relation between one thousand religion and the ideology of the kingdom – which is the base of government in Iran to this day - Gha-deri – set up with the Achaemenids and it was only this sort of ruling that would save the world from the evil of chaos and turmoil.... The Achaemenid authority established a basic hierarchy via combining divine rule and authority that was observed throughout the empire as though this hierarchy has began with Ahuramazda ...; hence, the right to rule became exclusive to them ... the rebellion against the Achaemenid king was considered as the uprising against Ahuramazda and his universal system. These beliefs and ideals were clearly expressed in the first inscriptions of Darius the first in Bisotun ..., the tomb of Xerxes ... and the script of the inscription of the Cyrus' manifest, with the difference that Cyrus as the king of Babylon has been described and sanctified by Marduk, the god of Babylonian and not Ahura Mazda" (Garthwaite, 2004, in trans by AliBabaie, 1385/2006: 97). In Achaemenids (the political system), whatever the king did was in fact executing the orders of Ahuramazda (in Cyrus it is Marduk, Qaderi); therefore, all activities of the king is out of the realm of curiosity and supervision of the people" (GhaziMoradi, 1389/2010: 63-64). During the Achaemenid era, the system of governance was absolute tyranny, and the king (Shah) was the representative of Ahura Mazda ... He could eliminate anyone who wanted without trial even the king's beloved was also free to kill others" (Rezaei, 1384: 313). The Achaemenid king did not use his sword in his name far from his own land, but in the way of executing the divine commandments and the actions of the king approved by the great god; this issue indicated absolute obedience" (Grishman, *ibid*: 68). According to the Iranian people, there were two essential tools in the hands of goodness against evil to defeat it, one was co-religion people and the other monarchy and the obedience of the king ... According to the book *Din Kard*, the religion is Shahriyari (governing) and governing is religion "(Amozgar, 1385/2006:153).

The divine right of kings (Farehzadeh), along with ancestry, are the two main elements of the legitimacy of the Achaemenid kings (Wiesehofer, 2001, in trans by saqibfar, 1377/1998: 5051). The legitimacy based on the divine right having its own especial word, "Khoreneh" is known as "Fare" in Persian language " (Garthwalet, *ibid*: 122). The Achaemenid kings were neither worshiped nor claiming to be descendants of the gods; nevertheless, they had a special relationship with the supreme being. The legitimacy of the ruler and his theoretical tyranny reflected his position as the representative of Ahura Mazda - "I am the king at the will of Ahura Mazda, these are the countries that I became their king over them on earth thanks to Ahuramazda (Qaderi)" (Garethwalet, *ibid*).

The Achaemenid / Iranian political order is a continuation of the galaxy order, and the king (Shah) is Ahuramazda's successor under this order. The Shah is in the common ground of this world and the divine world, and these two worlds are related with each other based on his mediation (Briant, *ibid*: 369). The insurrection against the Shah is the rebellion against the galaxy order and the world system, and Ahura Mazda. Even Mazdayasna is dependent on the kingdom to win over devil" (Maskob, 2536:19). All this emphasis on the king and his metaphysical legitimacy were due to the lack of Shah's popular acceptance among the defeated nations, such as Medes. An accepted and a chosen Shah, such as Astyages does not have any needs to emphasize on divine legitimacy.

In the thought of Iran land, the person of the Shah is counted as the god on earth, and the most solid institution of the political system of Iran (Tabatabaie, 1380/2001: 115]. Shah is described by the word "Kheshaytyh" and based on "Benonist" it meant God" in ancient Persia, which became the Shah's word in the new Persian. Benonist further added that the ruler is called Khwataw in the Soghdian language, which in essence means autocratic in its lexical meaning, that is, one who has absolute power and his power is not owed to anyone else, and the Greek word autocrat is the loan translation of it. The word "Khwtay" in Middle Persian refers to the word "Khoda=God" which means possessing absolute power. The word "God" in Iran, unlike the Indo-European religions, does not represent the right path, in Iran, however, we observe the emergence of absolute power, which the Achaemenid Kingdom was conceived as its realization (Benveniste, 1969: 17-21). Therefore, the history of Iran's kings was composed under the title of "Khoday Nameh = God of the Letter". Shah's sovereignty is an absolute example of Allah's/Ahuramazda's rule in the sky. "The fact that six of Iran's nobles helped the king in administering affairs shows a correspondence the reign of the heavenly monarchy where Ahuramazda ruled there along with six great Amshaspands (Majesticists). The situation is governed through an order inspired by the heavenly and divine plan. "(Boyce, 1982, in trans by San'atizade, 1381/2002: 142). Thus, if the pattern of the rule of the Achaemenid kings is established and convincing based on the design of the Achaemenid monarchy, the ritual of the people's behavior with the king also is the ritual of their presence against God (Ghazi Moradi, 1389/2010: 72). For this reason, in the coming of the Shah, all must bend on their knees because the Shah is the true meaning of Yazdan (God) (Olmsted, 1948, in trans by Moghadam, 1384/2005: 385). The central and main core of Achaemenid art is reflected in the nature of the king's person and everything is related to him; the minds and thoughts of the serfs should be influenced by the manifestation of his power in every moment (Champdor, *ibid*: 359). "In the Achaemenid pattern, the king was above social classes, whose full power was based on a feeling and that was absolute loyalty of the serfs to the ruling governor ... which represented God and was worshiped and respected as much as the divine being; the serfs from the highest

officials to the commanders were all among the servants of the king without exception" (Champdor, *ibid*: 410-411).

According to Hegel's theory, Seyed Jawad Tabatabai considers the notion of the Kingdom as the true one with regard to the Achaemenid tradition and called it "not a state, but the state of states, unity in plurality, which dominated nations formed a unified nation while maintaining their own language, customs, diversities and plurality. The monarchy was a lasting unity along with the provision of all the tribes' interests and their freedom, which would change their transient equilibrium into a stable nation. Although it was repressing the insurgents, it was not in favor of ethnic superiority of one tribe over other tribes, but it was to maintain equilibrium among all the ethnic groups" (Tabatabaie, *ibid*: 143-145). According to the previous materials in this chapter signaling the kings' divine right, parsism, impunity of only Persians to pay taxes, hostility, enmity and violence against the Medes and ..., Tabatabai's words woven by his own imaginations and it is only molding his own ideal model on Iranian history. Here, we only focus on the word of kingdom in the thought of Tabatabai. He has abstracted this concept on the basis of Hegel's thought. As Tabatabai himself pointed it out, at Hegel's time, "many of the angles of ancient Iranian history were not known yet" (Tabatabaie, *ibid*: 145). Hegel lived at the peak of the Aryanism era in which Iran should have been portrayed as the history of the superior race of Aryan to present a positive image of its own past. At that time, still outstanding Iranianologists were not familiar with Iran and its reigning system beyond the myths of Iranian Shah worshipers that also manifested itself in Herodotus. If Hegel was familiar with the thoughts of such prominent Iranianologists as Christensen, Grischmann, Wiesenhof, Pierre Bariano, Mary Boyce, Diakonov, and others whom we previously had references to their contents about the Persian divine right and despotism, he would not surely go astray.

As it was said before, Manual Cook has not recognized the Achaemenid Empire as a Kingdom and he has taken this word as to be more accurate about the Medes. Benveniste also has not known the word "Shahanshahi" as a Persian word, but a word taken from the Medes language. In the ancient language, many words have been taken from Xasayasiya, in which the Austaini term "xasarsa" indicated the power and the land (the world) where power is exercised on. When Darius says, "Ahuramazda, the one that donated xasara to me," it should be understood both to mean the kingdom and the land upon which he commanded (Benveniste, 1969, 17-21). We will continue to elaborate on the borrowing of Median terms by the Persians, but by changing their content. Here too, only the original word "xasara" was derived from the Median language, but its meaning has been completely changed. If we look carefully at the writings of Benveniste, he will consider the root of the word of the king (Shah), power and land from the word "Xasayasiya". If the origin of the word Shahanshahi "Xasarsa" was Median/Kurdish, its adaptation to the words of land and power would also be Median. But in Iran, along with the change of power from the Median social contract to the divine right of kings in Pars, its meaning has also changed. The origin of the word khshathra-varirya which denoted the kingdom, as well as the city and the king, it also meant the kingdom. Further, variya also means chosen, which means the chosen king in general. According to what we said about Median state, the Shah in Media formed, not based on the celestial legitimacy /the divine right, but on the earthly legitimacy and social contract. That is, the king of Media and his power and the kingdom are the result of a consensus of a collection of kings and local leaders. The root of the power of the king in Media was taken from the land (the world) and its inhabitants, i.e. from bottom to top. The meaning of the land (its inhabitants), which was the basis and source of the power of the

Mad Shah, was changed into the land where power was exercised in Iran. The kingdom which also means the word of the world (land) is rooted in word of the world in Mede. The Shah is a worldly and terrestrial concept. Through changing the legitimacy of the Median contract to the Persian divine right, the Shah takes on a metaphysical concept, and instead of deriving the root of the kingdom power in the world, he gets his power from Ahura and the sky. Therefore, the world that was the source of the king's power was transformed into a world where the power of the king was exercised on. The worldview of the Mede concerning the power refers to the earthly concept of power and the land from which power is derived, but in the Avestan worldview, it turned into the power and the land in which power is exercised on.

Thus, unlike Tabatabaie's view, with regard to the ideology and hierarchical nature of the Achaemenid community, all authority came from the king's person (ultimately Ahuramazda) (Garthwaite, *ibid*: 127). This hierarchical (Platonic justice) essence of Iranians requires the unity and obedience of Allah instead of agreement and community. The idea of the Median consensus against the Persia unity is clearly evident from the two words of Hegmataneh and His Achaemenid. Hegmataneh means the place of community and consensus (Grishman, *ibid*: 116) and Hakhamenish Means the idea of unity (Hinz, 1978, in trans by Rajabi, 1986/2007: 55). The difference between the two words of unity with community is the difference between the two systems of Median and the Iranians along with the transfer of power from the Medes to Iranians. The government changed from arbitrarily and judgement between people into the rule and governing over the people 58 (Rezaei, *ibid*: 12). The common word of the kingdom should not cause us to ignore the structural differences between the two systems of the Median and the pars and the two patterns of contract and conquest. Kingdom in the Mede has not accompanied the concept of Farne / Khoraine or Farehzadi (God's glory). As Justi rightly pointed out Farne is a Persian word not a Median one (Justi, cited in Widengern, 1968, in trans by Farhang, 1377/1998: 162).

We said that the two elements of the divine right 59 and the Persianism's dynasty (family) are the basis of the Achaemenid ideology in gaining legitimacy. Wisheffer writes: "The Achaemenids emphasized on the word "Persian" more than the word "Aryans", and referred to their relation to Persia in the difference with the Medes" (Wiesehofer, 2001, in trans by Saqibfar 1377/1998:s 13). Parsism is well-known in the inscriptions of Darius which we will focus on it later. Nevertheless, is it possible to infer the parserian veins in Cyrus despite his interestoriented character?

Pasargadae is the main Achaemenid palace in Fars, and its name is derived from Pars, the name of the tribe of Cyrus. Pasargadae was personally and politically important to him – Cyrus. It was important even after the construction of the Perspolis, Pasargadae remained an important criterion for the legitimacy of the government as well as a ceremonial center for coronations "(Garthwaite, *ibid*: 101). What did all the significance of the Pasargadae come which even the next Achaemenid kings, in spite of the larger and more impressive palaces such as Persepolis, Susa and Babylon, and ... still crowned there? Straubon says: "Cyrus praised Pasargada so much because it was in this place that he had made the last battle that he triumphed over isthyvigo (Astyag) ... and it put the Asian empire in his hand; thus, he built Pasargad palace in order to survive the memory of that event "(Book 15, chapter 3, paragraph 8, cited in Briant, *ibid*: 132) 61. Thus, Pasargadae, the capital and the symbol of the Achaemenid Empire was constructed in honor of the victory over the Medes and More importantly, it is rooted in the word of Pars

meaning the emphasis on tribal / ethnic lineage of Persians that gave credibility to "the Achaemenid tribal (ethnic- Qaderi) origion and the past of Cyrus" (Garthwaite, *ibid*:101).

Therefore, as the foundation of the Achaemenid Empire / Achaemenid kingdom / Iran and the idea of the founding of the capital (Pasargadae) was formed based on the negation and destruction of the Medes and the survival of their memory, the ideology of the Iranians / Achaemenids legitimacy developed based on the negation of the ideology of the state / kingdom of the Medes. They referred to the Zarathustra's royal parishness and legitimacy and they founded an oligarchic and a hierarchical system in contrast to versatile and anti-aristocratic justice of the Medes. This does not mean that they hve deliberately made such a plan but conceptually, the basis of the Persians/Iranian nation / empire / ideology, and ... were developed depending on the rejection and making the Medes as "the other". Contrary to the viewpoint of some scholars 61, the Iranian empire system has not only been in the continuation or evolution of the Mede kingdom system, but it has been shaped in digression of it in every aspect. The whole empire and political system of the Iranians / Achaemenids is a pure modeling of the Mesopotamian and Assyrian political intellect. The concepts (not the words) of FarehIzadi (God glory), the role of Ahura Mazda, the representative of the Shah from behalf of God, the hierarchy and ... are originated from Mesopotamia and the Sami race, as the Persian language (the structure and not its Median words) is rooted in the Aramaic and Sami language.

With the triumph of Pars over Med, Eunice (the god of dreams) entered the heart of the people, and Dika (God of Hierarchical Justice) won over Eros. With the triumph of Cyrus over the Medes, Zeus swallowed Mettis, the wisdom Asen was abolished by Goshan-e of wisdom song. People deprived MedeA of monarchy forever because of the fears of his magic, just as Zaghak / Azhydak was deprived of the history due to the fear of his spells. Percius the-son of Zeus killed cursed snaky-hair Medosay with the help of the temple of Athena and the god of Hermes. Zhulqarenin destroyed Yogi and Magog. The short period of Mede rule is a symbol of the short rule of Dionysos (Zagros) and the magician's Medes. One was destroyed by the Titans, and the other via the magic fears and ... . Medes were also forever deprived of ruling which was a radiation of the historical deprivation of the Kurds from having a govern-ment (a sentence is also narrated from prophet Mohammad in this regard). The oath of Cyrus's loyalty to Astyagh was a symbol of Yasoon's oath to Medes which was broken as the result of the fear of the Medes nobles from the people or Zahhak. Furthermore, Medes/Kurds are like a snake which guided Eve and Adam to eat the forbidden fruit (lust and knowledge), but the snake itself was condemned to misery forever. The snake was cursed by God to deprive it of his legs and to eternally be condemned to attach to the ground. Killing the snake became the essence of its relationship with man kind. Likewise, kurds were condemned and deprived of the government, and the essence of their relationship with the Arabic/Turkish ration has been nothing but repression and negation, and it has been "overwatching" in the Iranian intel-lect in addition to suppression and negation. The Kurd Prometheat gave freedom as gift to history, but Cyrus and Persians gave bread and gains to it.

- Iranian Monarchy: Continuation of the Mesopotamian Pattern, not the Median:

Let's look at the pattern of Iranian monarchy being influenced by Assyria and Elam / Mesopotamia and not from Median Cyrus's own language before presenting the theories of

historians. The broken piece of Cyrus's cylinder was rebuilt by "Burger" in Nice museum. In this text, Cyrus explicitly considers the Assyrian BoniPal, the great king of Assyria, as his political model (Anzeig von c. B.; Walker.Iran.1972) 62. Cyrus sought to connect himself with the previous rulers of Mesopotamia after the discovery an inscription of Assyria Bonipal (Kuhrt, 2007: 51). Moreover, Cyrus knows Mardok, the God of Mesopotamia as his own God his kingdom as from his mercy: "Mordok ... examined all the lands, all of them ... the just princes and he found the one according to his will, took Cyrus' hand the King (Shah) of Anshan and he Announced his name and called her as the King all over the world ... "(Cyrus Cylinider cB) 63. Cyrus describes himself as the king of Anshan in his cylinder. Thus, "Cyrus liked to manifest himself as the heir of the kings of Elamite (who has a Babylonian political culture, Ghaderi) similar to his predecessors in the mountainous country of Anshan" (Briant, *ibid*: 139). Cyrus decorated his palace with the symbolic Assyrian-Babylonian statues (Hints, *ibid*: 117).

Moreover, the most basic concept of Iran's political wisdom, namely, Farehe Izadi (the supremacy) and the image of Ahura Mazda in the form of the Eagle wings, which presents the circle of legitimacy and power to the King, is taken from the Assyrian / Babylonian civilization. "In Elamite religion, the gods and kings have a special forces known as" Kidden ", a divinely or magical force; thus, it is likely that fareh is the product of cultural exchange with Elam and Mesopotamia, not Aryan ... The name of this force is Melmmu in the Assyrian, that is the same Elamite Kidden and Iranian Farah" (Bahar, 1377/1998: 142). The Iranian ruling system accepted not only monotheism, but also transformed the absolute and sacred Assyrian power into the form of a holy and absolute Persian Kingdom. If the Assyrian king lost the grace of God, Melmmu also would escape from him. It was the case in Iran too, like Jamshid. The costumes of the Assyrian King were not different in any ways from the costumes of the gods. "In the Achaemenids and Sassanids, the Shah and God also dressed the same. There was a particular relationship between the Assyrian king and God such as Iran, which Darius was chosen by Ahura ... The Assyrian king was the great cleric ... In Iran, the king was above all the classes and the clergy and the king was the priest ... " (Bahar, *ibid*: 164-65). The content of the Achaemenid inscriptions is similar to and derived from the rules of Hammurabi (Bahar, *ibid*: 410).

The images of Ahura Mazda are also adapted from Assyrian images (Shahbazi, *ibid*: 341), which gives the ring of legitimacy to the Assyrian kings. This winged structure that is defined as the symbol of Ahura Mazda is related to Egyptian Horus borrowed by the Assyrians, and then reached Persia (Yamauchi, 1937, in trans by Pezeshk, 1390/2011: 491). The influence of Assyria and Mesopotamia on the Iranian political intellect is also well illustrated in the art of Persepolis. The winged male bulls over the gates of Persepolis were the guardians of the Assyrian palace that inspired Iranian artists (Razi, 1382: 242; Boyce, 1982, in trans by San'atizadeh, 1381/2002: 93). Also, the lion hunting of the Iranian kings is the result of the inspiration of the Assyrian culture (Boyce, *ibid*: 152). Lions is a devil and evil-natured beast in the heavenly religions both Zoroastrian and Assyrian "(Boyce, *ibid*: 157) We will later compare ancient Iranian works with Medes, here only to make clear that Iranian culture is influenced by Mesopotamia and against Median, I indicate that in the documents a Assyrian / Mesopotamia and Persia, the cow has always been sacred cows and the lion has been cursed. As the result, Darius the king and the kings of Assyria have always been pictured hunting or squashing lions in the colorful pictures of their palaces. However, the stone lion is one of the few works that has remained of the Medes. The main mission of Median god meaning Mitra - then we will pay more attention to it – is killing cows. Therefore, Persian, Assyrian, and Mesopotamian



culture have considered the cow holy and lion cursed, while the Median culture have regarded lion as sacred and killed cows.

Furthermore, contrary to Herodotus's account to consider the Achaemenids empire to be the continuation of the Median monarchy, and also that the Greeks themselves regarded the Achaemenid invasion of Greece as Median wars, written and archeological sources do not confirm Median invasive foreign policy and their centralized kingdom (Mason, 2009: 460-461; Helm, 1981: 86). The Assyrian cuneiform resources regarded the Mede's rule as numerous and scattered with local leaders (Liverani, 2003: 17). It is hard for us to believe that a Median multiple government model was the model or the foreground of the Pars imperialism (Mason, Ibid). The invasion of the Medes was only against the powers like Assyrian that did not recognize them and they would conquer their land After the repulsion of Assyrian danger, the Med made peace treaty with the powers of the region, such as Babylon, Laid and others. It was with the advent of the Persians and the rule of the Achaemenids, which breached peace and balance, and destroyed all ancient civilizations. Indeed, Cyrus was the reproduction of Assyrian imperialism, that would invade other lands and territories, and would turn their resources and their lands into the personal property of his armies and would take their people as their slaves.

Zeus and Marduk did not worry about the coming of Cyrus because their followers could confidently come to their temples (Champdor, *ibid*: 416) In all three heavenly books, Cyrus is praised by the God. Cyrus is the executor of the desires of Babylon and Jehovah (FarshadMehr, 1385: 220). "Achaemenid rulers in Egypt gave the Egyptian gods their due respect. On the contrary, when they conquered Greece, they burned all the temples and there is no evidence that they sought to reconcile with the gods whom they despised their temples. In addition, here is no evidence that the Persians have ever learned the name of Zeus, the Apollon, or Hera, etc." (Champdor, *ibid*: 210). Darius who revered the Babylonian and Egypt temples completely and was tolerant "destroyed all the temples of Mithraism" (Hinz, *ibid*: 371). The Cyrus and Darius tolerance with Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt, and their strictness against the Mitra and the Greek temples shows the cultural homogeneity With Bab-ylon and Egypt and the difference and antithesis against the Median and Greece culture. Thus, the Achaemenid tolerance has had shown in certain cases: if tolerance had been against the Jews, it would have been because of the similarity between the Jews and Ahura Mazda (Hinz, *ibid*: 113). If tolerance had been against the temples of Egypt and Bab-ylon, it would have been due to the similarity of their political and cultural structures which were based on the heavenly legitimacy and fareh Izadi (God's glory) and... . However, they not only had no tolerance versus their difference with Median Mithra (we will come to it then) which was based on the social contract and the earthly legitimacy and also versus the Greece which was democracy-oriented, but also, they destroyed them all.

-Iranian religion versus Median rite: Zoroaster's sunrise, Mithra's sunset:

Median ritual: Mithra (Mehr)

Ordinarily Mehr is considered as sun-worshipism and an Iranian ritual. The pre-assumption of the researchers in regarding Mithra rite as an Iranian one is that they have considered political

boundaries of Iran the same as the cultural ethnic /common borders. Unaware that the political boundary of Iran does not mean religious / ethnic equality within this boundary. The Sunprayism of Mehriyan is the late Iranian Mithraism by Zeroasterian Mogies, and has nothing to do with the principle of the Mithraism. After the hegemony of the views of “Vermazan” and “Frantis Coumont”, it was “Wikider” who discovered the non-Iranian roots of Mithra correctly; further, "Mia" and "Pawltine" correctly understood that the origion of Mitra means contract and agreement, and it is nothing to do with the Iranian Sun-prayism. “Mehovuhr” and “Wiedigren” also emphasized on the Median roots of Mithra. Contrary to the prevailing theory, the Duchess-Gamen, Zener, and many others admitted that Mithra not only has connec-tion with Zoroastrianism, but Zarathustra made Mihtra as a devil based on the rejection of Mithra's religion. Moreover, Mithra is not sacrificing, but killing it, and the ceremony of cow-killing was held in dark caves away from sunlight and fire along with water springs and ani-mals such as snakes and scorpions and lion. These animals are the symbol of earth, body and instinct; therefore, contrary to the seven mystical / Iranians obstacles or chalenges are seven Mithraism challenges are not assention to metaphysics and spirituality, but fall into the base-ment and the body and biological emancipation. The direction of the snake, scorpion and wa-ter is toward the underground in contrast to the eagle, the cow and fire. Inevitably, the so-lar/mystttical Mithra is not the original Mithra of the Median, but it is the Iranian constructed one to forget the previous Median

#### Median being of Mithra:

The Kurds have been Mithraist since the Goths, Mitany, Mannay, and Medes. Of course, not Mitra as a heavenly and worshipable god, but as a social ritual in the sense of contract and paradise. For the first time, Mehrism (Mitra) has been prevalent among the Medes in western Iran (Rostampour, 1382/2003: 26). According to Herodotus, the Medes admired the god of "Mith-ra" (Herodotus, cited in Christensen, 1944, in trans by Yasemi, 1382/2003: 70) 65. At that time ( Herodotus' era), the people of wester Iran were not yet acquainted with Ahura Mazda (Rajabi, 1380/2001: 29); in the land of the Medes, the god of Mithra was worshiped before the Avestan and Achaemenid time in a non-Aryan land (Hofer, cited in Closka, in trans by Saqibfar, 1385/2006: 365). The word “Mitotres” dates back to 3500 AD. "Domizel" knows Mithra as an Indo-European word, but” Bonfanta” proved that it belonged to an Indo-European period (Bonfanthe, cited in Closka, ibid: 86).

The words of "Mittra" in all languages express the name of Mitra among the Median people. The word "Mitra" in the Elamite and Greek sources - Mitrobats - and Aramian all state the specific names of Mitra among the Median people "(Hofer, ibid: 366). The stability of Angnand's arguments about Mitra has proven that Medians were Mithraists (Hoffer, ibid: 366). In general, it is common to assume that the Latin and Roman forms of the Mithra represent it as belonging to Median dialect. (Hofer, 1964: 12-13). Angnand considered different names of Mad, Guti, Omanmanda, Manna, Huri, Mehr (Mithra), Mars and ... as in address to a particular people, that is, the same Medi (Onegnand, cited in Aliev, ibid: 100). According to all appearances, Mithra has a separate role and the form of its name is more Median than Persian, and the pronunciation of the names of Mithras in Pars shows that it has newly arrived and they

had difficulty pronouncing it" (Wedengren, 1968, in trans by farhang, 1377/1998: 174-170). The name of Mithra has been originated from the Mithra-Mehr - the god of that nation; Mede means middle, which means either Mithani or central (Safizadeh, 1385/2006: 31; Mofrade Kahlan, 1375/1996:159). In India, sometimes they use the word "Asura-Medes instead of "Asura - Mitra" (Boyce, cited in Newly, n.d., in trans by sayd Sajad, 1381/2002: 256). In the mythologies, sometimes the name Mitra is termed as Sora or Mede (Razi, 1381/2002: 143) The origion of the term Mitra is rooted in the word Med and it has gone from Med to India. The Medes were Mehists (Schmidt, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 100) 66.

In the clay-made tablet found in Kirkuk belonging to 2500 BC, - the word mi - in - ta - ra - ti / mi - it - ta - ra - at - li is scribed having connection with the word "Mithra". The first place where Mithra is written down on tabets obtained by the German Hugo Voncler is located in the area of "Baghaz Koy" 67 in the east of Ankara from the Hittites and Mitany (Rostampour, *ibid*: 21). This Treaty belongs to the Mitany state, in which the name Mitra is regis-tered. The name of the Mitanian mithra is found on the jug. Thus, Mitanians have also accept-ed the god of Mithra (Hofer, *ibid*: 364). We can also look for Mithras found in Mithany in the Casies ... The special name of mi - it - rat (?) - ur - si has been found on a Caice seal"(Hoffer, *ibid*: 363 - 364). Therefore, as Bonfanthe has proven, Mithra has had a past involving 3500 years of age, and it is a term preceding IndEuropean.

Mithra's tradition has been prevailent from the Gothic period in 2500 AD in the same period that the Goths gradually dominated the Mesopotamia after defeating Naram Sin up to the time of Kossies, Mithanis, and Medes among the Kurds and their religions. Mitra / Mehr was not only the root of the word Mede, many of the particular Median tribes have also been re-nowned under this name.

Discussing Median ethnic features, Diakonoff considers Mehranis to be the third ethnic element of the Medes (Diakonoff, 1985, in trans by Keshavarz, 1379/2000:s 133). In the inscriptions of the Tokolati-Ninurta I (in the invasion of the land of the Medes), the Mehrani state has been mentioned. Part of the Median people would speak in Mehrani language (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 476). The language of the Mehrani refered to the areas of the Gothic land (later the Median) (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 210). The term "Mehri" and "Mehrano" in the Tiglat and the Ninurta in the 13th and 11th centuries signaled the local people of the Western Mede (*ibid*). Mehri is the same as Mannais who are predecessors of the Kurds (MofradeKalan, *ibid*: 157) The word Mithani and Mehri were the name of the tribal god of Mithani and Median people and they are also synonyms. Mehrano and Mehri were referred to the Medes and the Mithans corresponding to the God of Mehr, the most important god of Median and Mannai tribes. " (*ibid*: 158).

The ethnic group of Mar, that Herodotus stated it in the 6th century AD, is associated with Huryani – Subari people. According to Assyrian sources, there have lived Mehri and Mehran people in Orumiyeh and Van in the 13th century AD. Asarhadon mentioned Mehrani people living in Zagros. There have come the name of the country of Mehr in the contract of the kings of Hitti in the 13th century AD. In the Assyrian resources, there existed the name of the Mehri country near Sallo and Sala people were mentioned with the people of Manda in the sources of Hitayan. According to Assyrian sources in the 7th century AD, the inhabitants of the western Media spoke Mehrani language. The term "mhr" is the shorter form of a very old word for the Mehr.Theophilactus considered Mehr and Mehran as one of the famous Medi-anl families known to be Iranian later. Mehri people are on the list of non-Iranian peoples - Horyanis - and

Mehranis belonged to the Horyanis - Subaru. It is thought that this name is derived from the goddess of Mitra (Aliev, 1960, in trans by Mirbaha, 1388/2009: 100). Therefore, the name Mitra / Mehr is rooted in the ethnic inhabitants of the Medes, or the ethnic name of the inhabitants of Mehrani and Med are derived from the Mithra / Mehr religion. Mars mentioned by Herodotus and Khorni 68 are also derived from the name of Mehr. "Removing h is a general rule in Asit-ic language in which the word mahr becomes mar" (Aliev, *ibid*: 161). On the one hand, the totem of Medians was also worshipping snakes (Herzfeld, 1936, in trans by Hekmat, 1354/1975: 21). Mythic memories of the newcomer Aryans about the struggle with snakes and dragons are rooted in the snake (Mar)/Mehr worshipping culture of the Medes. A holy animal that accompanies Mitra in cow hunting has always been a snake and a scorpion. Therefore, the word of Mitra /Mehr is a Me-dian term, and Mehr / mmttraism has been dominant from 2500 BC, i.e. from Gottian to Mitany and Mannay and Mede in Kurdistan. "Mithraism was very common in the Mede" (Shayan, cited in Dehbashi, 1388/2009: 14).

Despite the hostility of the Zoroastrian religion and Achaemenids with the Mitra religion in which Darius has destroyed all the Mehrabes and works of Mitra, there have still remained some works in the Median land from the time of the Mithraism. Wolfram Kleis and Parviz Niloufari have known the holy temple of Musa Sair and the Fakhrika Temple located in the south of Lake Urmia - the works of the Median period – as among the samples of the Me-thraist temples, and the rocky chambers between Salmas and Urmia and ... as Mehrism temples (Ra'isNia, 1358/1979: 416 - 415). Mehri chapel of Badamaydar - Ghadamgah in 12 km of Azarshahr in the mountains of Qaleh Qandi digged and carved under a hill and a hard rock is closely related to the Mehri underground houses of worship in Europe. There is an acolyte hanging in the direction of Qibla which German archaeological team considered it as reconstructed in Saffavid era. They declared that this place (before Islamic manipulation) has not been built for Islamic purposes. It has not been neither a mosque, nor a tomb. Later on, this cellar has been erected in the form of an Islamic worship house with the help of the altar towards Mecca; therefore, it belongs to the pre-Islamic era or even it may be dating back to the pre-history period "(*ibid*: 418). Parviz Varjavand also studied it in 1354 and confirmed that "the creation of this altar is related to a very new era and has nothing to do with the time of the creation of the building. There are no similarities between this place and great religions of Mazdai, Zoroaster, Nahid, Jesus, and Islam and none of their temples but it is related to the ritual of Mehr. The birth of Mehr from the rocks of the cave is affiliated to the Mehr religion" (Verjavand, 1355/1976, No: 2&7). According to Verjavand, we see the works related to the ceremonies of Mehrism, such as the cult of Ahl-e Haq in western Iran, especially Kurdistan and Azerbaijan, more than anywhere else (*ibid*: 8). Abdul Ali Karang, after studying monuments and historical sites of Maragheh in 1350, also recognized the tomb of Imam Zadeh Masoom as a cave in the style of Mitra'i caves (Karag, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 423 – 424). Ardeshir Jahanian after the discovery of the Bass in Hassanlou (Hasanlu hill as one of the foremost fortresses of Mannei) wrote in the article "The golden cup in Hasanlou Hill" in Huhdah Magazine in 1337: "The patterns on this cup is related to Mehrism religion in which the fight against the contract-breachers corresponds with the designs on this bowl" (Jahanian, cited in Ra'isNia, *ibid*: 234 -235). Richard Frei also knows the stonework scribes of Qazkin in Shahrazur of Kurdistan as indicating Mehr religion (Frye, 1963, intrans by Rajabnia, 1344/1965: 246). Also there has been found images of gods with eagle's wings or half-human satans in Med and Huri religion (Diakonoff, *ibid*: 671; Dehbashi, *ibid*: 14), which belongs to

the Mithra-ism, because - we will later survey it more in detail - the ritual of Mitra is the same with the head of the lion or the devil (Inessler quoted in Yamauchi, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 581).

It is not only in the old Mede that the works of the Mithraism have survived; but even, we can trace -Mithraism in today's Kurds. J. Marr considered Yazidies to be original Kurds and their religion as pure Kurdish religion (Marr, cited in Nikitin, *ibid*: 465-462) in which they still perform Mithraism and bull-slaying ceremonies. The Lalesh Mehrabeh is a dark cavern in the style of Mithra's bull-slaying cave. The patterns of the snake, lion and Scorpio, the eternal companions of Mitra are designed. Spiegel considers the religion of the Kurds in Der-sim Mithraism and the works of Mithraism (Spiegel, cited in Nikitin, *ibid*: 65). Ivanof regarded the rituals of Ahl-e Haq as the continuation of Mehri rites (Ivanov, cited in Russell, in trans by Dehbash, 1388/2009: 770). Mitra is located in the center of the rites of Ahl-e Haq (Russell, *ibid*). Ahl-e Haq or Yarsanis call hogs short cows, and they kill hogs. They also kill roasters which is anti-Zoroastrian and agreeable to Mithraism. Videngren, referring to the sacrifice of the cows by the Khorvdiinians, considers it to be a well-known Mehri ritual (Videngren, cited in Russell, *ibid*). In what follows we will focus on the meanings of cow killing or its link to Mitra.

Despite the severe poverty of ancient archeology, several works have been discovered related to Mitra's religion in Mede. "But with all these archeological excavations in Iran, no ancient Iranian memorial has yet been discovered from the Mitra's religion" (Von Gall, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 570). There is no inscription, image, temple and statue of Mehr in Iran and in the future, there is no hope of finding it. Thus, Mithra belongs to a more ancient period of Iran "(Frye, *ibid*: 250-252). The origin of Mithra belongs to the Minor Asia (Frye, *ibid*., 324). Marr considers Kurds as the indigenous natives of the Minor Asia, (Marr, cited in Nikitin, *ibid*: 53) and up to the present time, there are no statues of cow-killing and other rituals related to Mithraism in the Persian land (Yamauchi, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 586). If an scriptures in Persepolis was influenced by the Mitra, it would be related to the army and the administrative code, not prayer (Yamauchi, *ibid*: 588). Criticizing Bowman, Hinkel does not recognize the evidences about the popularity of Mitra in Persepolis as a sign of the existence of a particular religion in Persia, but rather the personal interest of several soldiers or vowers of Persepolis. Aramian language experts have also rejected the translation of "Bowman's terminology (who considered some of Persepolis' works as referring to Iranian Mithraism),"Naw" and "Shaul Shaqad" also said: "We consider Cameron's non-religious notion more acceptable than Bowman's religious conception." Baruch Levine also writes: "Bowman considers Aramian texts of Persepolis as to be religious writings ... while they are, in my opinion, administrative notes, in which the names of the donors of these containers are engraved" (Yamauchi, *ibid*: 609).

But why do they recognize Mithra as an Aryan (non-Indo-Iranian) god? Firstly, it is widely believed that Mithra cannot be the general God of the Aryans, because if it had been Aryan, that God should have been worshiped in Greece too. However, there is no trace of the god of Mitra in Greece, so it is not an Aryan God` (Ashtiani, 2). Therefore, the existence of mitra among several Aryan peoples is not rooted in a common source, but it is the result of cultural influence and exchange. In the following, we will look at how Median/contractual Mithra became Iranian / Sunni. Here we will only historically study this point.

There is no convincible reason for the Indian immigration to the areas of Mitani kingdom over two thousand years to prove the Indian being of the god of Mitra in the Bhagās-kwah tablets. Since the scholars have encountered the name of Mitra in the Hindi / Iranian religious culture before the discovery of the Bhagazi tablets, they have accepted the presumption of Aryan /Indian being of Mithra. Therefore, they had to construct seemingly overwhelming hy-pothesis of Indian immigration to Asia Minor. If sharing the names and Mitani gods were found with Hindi, there would be no reason that a god had been Indian coming to Mitani and Zagros, it is more likely that the reverse can be more true. In Vedas, the name of Mitra is not mentioned alone except for one or two times and briefly, and Mitra-Varuna has come together there (Teheme, 1960: 39; Razi, 1381: 142; Varmaseren, 963, in trans by naderzad: 1345/1966: 10). In Iran - we will study this later - not only the significance of Mitra was diminished but Mithra became the devil and evil. However, Mitra has been worshiped alone in Mede and Mitani. The origion of the concept of Mitra was found to be as the contract in Mede and Mitani and also Mitani agreement but not in Iran and India. The origion of Mitra has benn transformed in Iran and India and it has come to mean Varuna in India and Ahura in Iran. Teheme correctly speaks of a Mithra earlier to Avesta and Riguda (Theme, *ibid* ;38) and he considered the Indians and Persians as re-sponsible for the transformation of the abstract concept of the contract to the imaginary char-acter of the agreement, which changed into a true and live god (Khnda. Alikhani, *ibid*: 76). Mitra had been a Median/Kurdish religion. Worshipping Mithra has never been the reli-gion of the Aryans and the Persians (Ashtiani, *ibid*: 37).

We do not deny the existence of Aryan / Indian linguistic evidence in the Mighty Kingdom. "They (Aryans, Qaderi) were mercenary soldiers in the service of the rulers as there existed positions like charioteer and most of them would return to steppes equipped with this ability ... taking jobs such as bull-coaching and being warrior" (Boyce, 1992, in tran by Tahami, 1386/2007: 77-78). It is possible that Aryans living in the Mitany dynasty migrated there from the steppes of southern Russia – based on Boys - and served as military mercenaries. They separated from the main branch and set off to India through east of Iran. The Mantyan dynasty was around 1400 AD, and the Aryan migration to India also happened around this time (Hertzfeld, *ibid*: 29). Thus, prob-ably, the Aryans migrated to Kurdistan region, and after being repelled by people there, they went to Sistan and the east like Sakais- and then India to bring the names of Mitra and ... with themselves there. "the Persian and Scythian people settled in India after the invasion of the northwest of India, and often they were on Mithraist religion and the sun Mithrist wor-shippers ... There has been some references to to Mogi Berhmans denotating those who set up solar temples called Sorya" (Razi, 1381:190).

Perhaps the presence of Mitra in India is due to the influx of the Hurrianes, who were busy invading from Egypt to India. "A number of researchers have considered Huriyan (Mitany) as to be the main nucleus of HEXUS who occupied Egypt and HEXUS had the origins of the Horyans" (Aliev, *ibid*: 152). B. Hurzeni", insists on the influx of the Hurrian on India that Struu "also supported it (Aliof, the same, 152.) Thus, it is possible for Mitra to migrate from the Medes and Mtani to India through the Hurrian or Aryan warriors`, especially since "Kerchemer" correctly persirsted on the local being of the Mitany gods - Mitra and ... (Kerchmer, cited in Aliev, *ibid*: 149). If, in accordance with Kṛṣṇa Batraji, the concept of Ahura in Rig Vida was derived from the Assyr of Assyrian, or, as Homel and Bahar say: Ahuramazda was from Assyr Mezas in Assyria (cited in Shahbazi, interview, 30), why Mitra would not go to India from Mede, especially there existed a sacred bull in both India and Egypt, probably

like the sacrament of cattle in Iran and the Gats, it has been a reaction to the bull-slaying of Mithra as the tradition of the old Medes/Hurids. "Unawal "and" Goose" believe that The winged eagle-shaped like the image of Ahuramazda in Iran has entered Assyria from Egypt and from Assyria to Iran and India (the same) and not from India to the west. Inevitably, Mithra has gone from the West - Mede - to the East - India. Because- as we state later – the origin of the concept of Mithra in the sense of a contract has been concretely realized at the political / social level only in Media /Mtnnyi and Gothsand there was no trace of it in India and Iran.

- Mithra: the contract or the sun

For decades, the thinkers considered shaping the Mazdayasna tradition on Mitra's ritual as the original Mithra, and they interpreted it via sun-worshipping and ascension of the spirit toward immortality. The hegemony of the ideas of Comen and Vermaceran was nothing but their personal perception in the study of the Mitra as Platonic philosophy – the ascension of the soul up to immortality soul of the sky and the sun and of liberation from the body (Closka and others, 1978, in trans by Saqibfar, 1385/2006: 6-7), Mithra religion was not ascension to the sky / the sun and the liberation of the body but it was the liberation of body from the soul and the fall into the world of Hades and darkness. The Mitra's religion had nothing to do with the immortality of the soul, the heaven and the sky and it was not similar to sun-worshipping and ... but it was a natural religion. Further, it was a social ritual and the god of Mithra was abstracting the concept of the social contract.

While acknowledging the Median being of Mitra, Hofer sees its main meaning as the contract (Hofer, *ibid*: 317-325). "Mitra means contract and agreement, and there is no evidence that the term Mitra originally meant as light or sun. Naming Mithra to mean light is not verified and it does not mean the sun in Veda or Avesta and this meaning has been added later "(Schmidt, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 388-390). The song of the sun and the anthem of the Mehr are distinct in Avesta (Razi, (413: 1381). Millet published an article titled "The Indian god and the Iranian Mithra" in 1907 in which he rejected the common belief that Mitra is the god of light and the sun, and he counted the moral character of the supporter of truth and hostility towards lying as among its secondary addenda. "Millet considered Mithra as the embodiment of the contract similar to Timis in Greece that is the illustration of justice (Millet, cited in Schmidt, *ibid*: 387). Supervision and protection of the contract is one of the oldest acts of Mitra (Jong, 1997: 285). Then Powell Thieme defended Millet's theory in which Mitra is a neutral concept meaning treaty (Hofer, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 361). "The concept of Mitra ... is the sanctity of the formal promises exchanged, the treaty, the covenant, and the contract ... As Millet also proved Mithra is not the god of the sun or any other natural phenomenon that is considered God but It is the realization of the sacred concept of the sacred contract" (Thieme, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 554).

The central thought of Mehrisht is the sacredness of the promise exchanged, which is in the form of a contract, whatever it is called agreement or contract ... ; therefore, there is no argument over it. Words such as loyalty and devotion - Lumel, or respect for parents as duty - Lenten, ... loyalty and devotion - Schmidt, which do not reflect the moral behavior of a lower person towards a person superior to him ... "(Thieme, *ibid*: 561-562). Theme has correctly said Mithra is neither loyalty nor devotion since the essence of these concepts is the acceptance of hierarchy. However, there is another significant point that Theme has paid less attention to

it and it is not only pre-contractual hierarchy, but also pre-contractual rules and sacraments. There are no pre-defined structure, law and sacred ordinances in the Mitra. There is also no Miter, he is not worshipped unless there is agreement of equality between individuals and groups. In fact, it is the contract that abstracts Mitra from non-existence and makes him enter the social existence. That is, whatever is not mere contract is secondary and complementary, and the god of the Mitra is personality-development and godliness are the same as the general meaning of the Mithra, ie, the covenant / contract (Millet, cited in Alikhani, 1384/2005, 1516). In Yesht 10/13, Mithra sets before the dawn of the sun but it later changed its meaning and became the same as the sun so that Mithra and the sun become irreplaceable "(Jong, 1997, 286). Afterwards, Mitra was originally the god of con-tract that later changed position war with the expansion to (Iran and India, Qaderi) into the god of the sun (Hinz, 1978, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 72).

Moreover, Mitra is neither a female nor a male; it is not only a trans-ethnic and religious concept, but also trans-gender notion. Powell Theme "denied Mithra Avestan and Indian Mithra but he considered the earlier Mithra as neutral. The Avestan and Rigudan Mithra are gods, but the earlier Mithra (Median Mithra, Qaderi) is neutral and contract. Mitra was interpreted as a friend in Rigauda that was not synonymous with the contract, but in contrasted to it. In Ancient Iran, it has not meant treaty at all but, as Hertzfeld says, it has been something similar to the moral obligation on which the community rests or, in the words of Herzfeld it has connoted piety. We must assume the sanctification of divinity and respect for religious orders including respect and obeying father and mother, the king and the others" (Thieme, *ibid*: 30) which meant the opposite of the earlier Mithra. In the earlier Median Mithra, there was no place for divinity and religion commands nor moral law preceding the treaty. The moral obligation, in the name of religion and the custom, has not had any meaning earlier than contract in Mithra in which society must be shaped through agreement and dialogue in advance.

In Mithra, there is no place for the worship and pray since there is no God and sacred being prior to the agreement of the parties to the contract / communicational society. "Unlike other religions in which people get reward for prayer and worship, Mithraism is not a prayer-or secrecy-based religion but it is a social-political ritual, and its rewards and punishments are the results of the sacred obligation to contract or breaching it" (Thieme, *ibid*). "Mehr's blessings for those loyal to contract and its punishment for those who defect it... are its rewards and punishments for their practical social and political behavior ... People must prove their worship to the other gods if they fulfill certain conditions such as sacrifice and it does not have a moral purpose ... Other gods require deities in return to people's sacrifice and praise with hope and regret in their religious dreams ... while Mitra is a sacred concept for real life in society" (Thieme, *ibid*: 556)." Zoroaster believed in the holiness of treaty but it was related to Hooman and Asheh ... The concept of treaty had nothing to do with Zoroaster's religious system and it was morality as based on principled ethical rules of truth, the nice notion of obedience, ruling, loyalty and ... which are all moral assumptions "(Theme, *ibid*: 561). Therefore, the treaty and agreement between two equal persons in the Zoroastrian religious thought has no place. In the Zarathustra's religious thought, the treaty and hierarchical convention is among the believers and the revelator or the servants with the ruler. The loyalty to the king / cosmic order through the orders of Zoroaster or the king is Zoroaster's moral and contractual obligation, not the earthly treaties between individuals and groups. In Mehr religion, the treaty with anyone with



any belief, whether good or bad, must be respected. In Mehr's perspective," the treaty with any one is right whether he is a Mazdadist, a Satanis, or a follower of any other religion.

"(Mehryasht, article II). The contract / treaty in Mehr's ritual is a transreligious and transethnic concept. The contract itself and the agreement between two people became the base for the good and the bad and legitimacy. There is no preset good and bad. Contrary to the Zoroastrian religion, which Zoroaster's sympathizers represent the good-ness and his opponents are the symbol of evil and ugliness, all the goodnesses are rooted in the agreement / consent, and all the evils originate from the absence of consent or coercion. Every action based on the consent of both sides is right and there are no predetermined taboos / illegal acts and limitations preset as is seen in Mehr Yasht.

Sections 116-117 of the Mehryasht is about an advanced social organization that is based not on the hierarchy of the king over the serf or the father or master over the son and the pupil, but on the foundation of an agreement and contract. Mehrisht must fulfill the value and re-ward of the contract/Mehr in the entire social structure of the family up to politics: "The value of contract - Mehr between two friends is twenty times -Meandodust to be the father of the father-in-law ... up to seventy times among the disciple and the teacher, ... eighty times the groom, Zamater, and Khosur's father,

Ninety times between two brothers ... one hundred times between father and child ... is a thousand times between two affiliated with a country (deyopathy) ... up to ten times equal to the average of the Madison ... "Gershwij complains that Mitra is not The only compromise agreements, but unwanted and natural - father and child, and ... - are included, the team correctly replies to Gershwitich: "If the Mitterah included a natural bond and it is seventy-times between the pupil and the teacher and .....eighty times between groom and the father- in-law , ninety times between two brothers... one-hundred between the father and the son ... it is one thousand times two people in the same state (Dehpoty) ...and it is ten thousand times between wisemen experts of Mazdayasna. Gershavich points out that Mitra also involves not only agreemental treaties but also it includes unwanted and natural contract like father-son. Thieme correctly indicates in response to Gershevitch "if Mitra also includes natural bond, I must leave aside the translation of contract since the contract is not natural but constructed and artificial and even it may also remove natural bonds (Thieme, cited in Alikhani, *ibid*: 31). Gershevitch's indication that Mithra includes natural contracts refers to the bond between father and son whom Gershvitch knows it as the blood and natural bond. However, the argument is reversed, Meheryasht's emphasis on the agreement between the father and son and the father-in-law and the groom ... whose reward is more than that between two friends is the negation of the natural law and the predetermined right of the father on the son. Meheryasht requires all relations as based on mutual agreement and consent. It wants to remove every kind of natural right and hierarchy whether it is between father and the son or the father-in-law and groom and ... which its reward is more than that between two friends. It wants all the social interactions based on contract and mutual consent. The fact that the value of the contract between people from the same homeland is twenty-times is due to this point that it is only contract that sets this relationship between them. Nonetheless, this value is one-hundred times between because apart from the contract, there is a predetermined relationship based on the paternal hierarchy and the natural right of the father over the son which the purpose of Mehryasht is to eliminate that predetermined relationship of the father's natural right on the

son. Mehrish's contract is completely artificial and anti-natural in which it is even better to formulate the relationship between father and son that is the most natural relationship, and the possibility of the son's right to be breached by the father occurs most often, based on the spiritus and consent of the two parties. It denies any natural and hierarchical right 71.

The agreement between mother and son, referred to in Mehrish, is also in the same direction. "Egling does not want to call the bondage of the mother and the son a contract, and he has brought a bond of friendship, but in Mithra, the relationship between mother and son is also a treaty, not natural, but it should be made" ( Thieme, *ibid*: 45). Even the relationship between the mother and son in which the deepest human emotions are realized must be based on twoside consents and it should be constructed. fictitious. Therefore, there is no predestined heavenly rights and taboos, no human unthought domain and suppressed dark instincts in Mitra's religion. When there is no pre-defined nature and relationships for human and relationship interactions and when bringing the human being is really permitted without any restrictions through making all human relationships artificial a contractive, cannot we extract the depth of feminist theories from Mitra's religion in which the intrinsic nature of male domination over women, and their differences are brought under question. Perhaps, it can restore women's rights without endangering the femininity of women much deeper than feminism because Mitra's religion does not have anything to do with Imprinted behavior of two genders, whatsoever it is must be formed based on predefined agreement and satisfaction not based on the preset right of man over man and ..... If there did not dominate metaphysical religions and moral constraint on, maybe the tragedies of Sovkal also was not sung.

Mehrist sees the value of the treaty between two people dependent on the same country as one thousand times. This point was very significant in the ancient eastern societies. The ancient eastern societies, apart from the Medes, were based on the sanctity of the Shah, the hierarchy, and the class society in which the political order was the continuation of the divine order, the shah was representing God (Ahura, Mordak, Allah, ...), his decree was considered as law and all people must obey the Shah and become his servants. Nevertheless, this part of Mehrish regarded even political relations as based on a social contract and consent and agreement through which the political order should be formed depending on the consent of the people and mutual agreement, not like Iran and Mesopotamia based on the divine right of the king or the royal race. For this reason, Theame correctly understood the concept of Mitra as meaning contract the same as the Rousseau social contract theory, and even much more advanced than that 72 whose concrete case is choosing Diako as Shah among Medes, which was based on general choice and earthly/contractual legitimacy. It pointed out the bigger the community, the greater its reward; for instance, two people affiliated to a country have a thousand times reward, but the father and the child have seventy times reward - contrary to Gershwil's opinion, it is due to its anti-naturalness. The more the relationships goes higher than that between blood and family bonds to the non-blooded social level, the greater its reward. If the treaty was dependent on blood and natural, there would be no relationship more natural and bloodier than between father and son, then it would have to be rewarded more. However, the reward of a kind of relationship is more that is not based on blood and kinship at but it is relying on security and civilization. Thus, in Mithraism everybody is the guardian of the treaty from the smallest social group up to the country and the state (Razi, *ibid*: 66). It means that every kind of relation must be based on contract and treaty and it must be from the bottom to the top, that is, from the

smallest institution of society, the family, to Weiss, Zante and Dyupit, the political organization of the country, and not depending on the hierarchy and the sovereignty of the king or a class.

Therefore, Mithra is the religion of covenant and a contract, not sun-worshipping. "Sun-praying is rooted in among the nations in which ruling in their society is based on a more heroism and sophisticated basis, i.e. the method of sun-worshipping is followed in a organized society that has reached political unity and central power ... Wherever the centralized government relies on the dominant kingdom and the army, there has been provided the condition for sunworshipping" (Razi, 1381/2002: 435). Therefore, the Sun has such a high position in Iran and the Semitic nations and Plato's philosophy and the Iranian political despotic system turned the anti- solar Mithra into philo=solar entity; while, Mithra was against depoticism and sunworshipping; Mithra is the same Loyatan which revived with the help of social contract theory of Hobbes who questioned the foundation of metaphysical legitimacy.

The final piece talks about ten hundred times being of the covenant value between the followers of the Deana Mazdayasna. Contrary to other scholars' views 74, Hashim Razi correctly describes it as a recent Zoroastrian addition (Razi, *ibid*: 58). Mitra has never been a religion, and there has never come into existence a religion called Mitra (Ashtiani). This is a Zoroastrianized/Iranianized part of Mitra that we will look at it later. In paragraph 117 of Mehryasht, the most basic contract that its value is one thousand times is that between two countries. "Lantes" sees this piece as vague and says that the covenant between two potential enemies is not important. The Theame correctly responds to the Lantes using international nonaggression treaties (Thieme, *ibid*: 37). Even in the era of the empires and eastern occupation wars, Mithra considers the relations between the two countries as based on the treaty. Mede also established its foreign policy on the bases of the treaties and preserving them with Babylon, Lydia and others in contrast to Cyrus and Achaemenid who did not believe in any treaties and rights for others, and assaulted all other countries with all their rivals and sword.

The seal of Droj / Lie is a Mithraist notion meaning lying to Mehr or Mithra's opposition to the lie, which is in fact the same opposition of lie with the covenant and breaching treaties. However, Iranian/Zoroastrian culture has as usual seized that concept but it has completely changed its meaning. The lie, in contrast to Mitra, is counter to the treaty, not a person or a particular political power. Nonetheless, when we see Darius using the concept of lies in the inscription of Bisotun, he addresses the political opponents and everyone who is submissive to him, he considers him as right and his political offenders as the liars. It is only the confiscation of the concept having no relation to the lie as viewed by Mithra which refers to the contract between two equal parties because it is not a treaty between two equal persons, but obedience to serf to the master in the Iranian political structure.

Mitra is remembered in Mehryasht, paragraph 61, as the agent of water storage from which the rain falls and plants grow. In this case, Theme also rightly denies the myths regarding the study of the nature and the Sun in the analysis of this piece of mehryasht, and even he interpreted it as based on contract and fulfilling it in this case (Thieme, cited in Alikhani, *ibid*: 41). But he was unable to analyze it correctly and has analyzed it based on eastern, Iranian / Samian myths. From the point of view of the Theame, since the rainfall and the order of the nature were dependent on the king's behavior, the king must be loyal to his commitments for the rain and growing the plants to continue (the Theame, the same). Contrary to Theame analysis, there must be all relations from family and marital relations to relations between the

king and people and the relations between the two countries as based on the contract; hence, there is no place for the traditional mentality of rainfall that depends on the behavior of the kings. If in the ritual of the Mithra, the king was so sacred that the rain and vegetation growth was de-pending on him, the commandments and orders of the king were themselves the law, and it did not require a social contract and a treaty. The storage of water and the growth of plants connote completely as related to the concept of earthly social contract, not the metaphysical behaviors of the kings. To analyze it, we need to take a deeper look into Mitra and the way of his birth. Mitra brings out water with its bow and arrow after her birth from the rock, and af-ter hunting the sun and killing the holy cow. It is unlike the Sami / Islamic and Iranian culture that bring out water from the heart of the earth via handing prayer to the sky, or throwing an arrow toward the cloud - like Fereydoun. The origion of water is from the heart of the earth and it is evaporated water that rises to heaven and falls down on the land. The Iranian / Sami metaphysical cultures know the origion of water from the clouds and the sky and it is through praying and giving in to their imaginary god that they expect rain and vegetation. But Mitra neither expects anything from the sky nor he raises his hands up to the sky but he takes water out of the ground with the power of his own arm. In the ritual of Mitra, the flourishing and flowering of plants and water do not have anything to do with the gods' favor and the representing the gods and the kings. All these is depending on the security and peace which are based not on the rule of despotism and hierarchical order but on the basis of a consensual agreement and order from the bottom. If order is set up in every society, agriculture can flourish and using water and wells and cannabisation becomes possible. Therefore, Mithra that is the source of rain and plant growth denotes preserving the contract and agreement for the sake of security, and then the development and prosperity of agriculture. It bears no natural metaphysical interpretation. Booming agriculture and prosperity of each society depends on security and security relies on observing contract in Mitra not obedience to the king. When Herodotus says that Mithradat was the shepherd of Astyagh herds, he does not mean him to be a person, it is symbolic. Mitra is means the pact of preserving the relationship between the people and the king. It is shepherd protecting the herd from the wolf, and Mitra is also protecting the people from the kings' offense.

However, water here also has another meaning, that Mitra is boiling water has a philosophical meaning beyond nature, that is, water is defined versus fire. For this reason, the Mithraeans held their cowkilling rites in the caves having water springs which is the continuation of the meaning of the cowkilling and darkness of the cave. For this reason, Zarathustra protected the fire against water, the water is fowing down towards the earth / underground, but the fire is dirrecting toward the sky. Water against fire is the philosophical opposition of the earth with the sky as well. In several of the symbols discovered in the Mitrahi caves, Mitra is depicted riding the arbours that a few horses pull it. One of the horses is trying to drag Mithra to the ocean - water, but the owner of the chariot, the sun, which accompanies Mitra, is blocking the passing of the rogue horse, which is a symbol of the Plato's horse, toward the ocean, and he pulls the horse's tether toward the sun/sky. This image of the contrast of water with the sun corresponds with the original Median Mithra with the Iranian sunshine Mithra.

This also applies to "Mithra owning vast grazinglands". The subject of wide pastures ...urvi gavyi in Riguda is very close to the concept of the security abhaya. Bennonist and the Theame have translated that this pasture around the place widens in peace and the livestock are freely busy grazing in vast areas, and there is the threat of ambush there in the wake of war, so they

should be kept close to the village in the baskets, for that reason, Mithra is called... *urvi gavyuti* it save people from roughness and grazeland gets vast in peace and security (Thieme, cited in Aikhani, *ibid*: 45). The concept of the full pasture also conforms completely to the contractual meaning of the Mithra. If there establishes the peace and security in society via observing the two-way agreement, the possibility of robbery and plunder and destruction will also be eliminated, and the livestock, without fear of stealing and ambushing by the enemy, will be freely busy grazing and the pastures will be vaster in the security.

Contrary to the class society in the Gats (Yasna, article 32, 1, Yasna 33, and Yasna 45) 75, there is no news about the division of society into classes in Meheryasht. "We worship Mehr when needed, he is the master of the country, tribe, city, village and the house of God. .." (Yasht 10, Kerde 22). Goths speaks about the farmer, cleric, military and ... classes, but in Mehr there is no mention of any class and the master of the city and the village is named. There are all people from every class in the city and ... . Mitra addresses all people from the ruler to the simple farmer and in the ritual of the Mithra, there is no immunity for Shah or cleric to denounce Mitra / the treaty. Mithra sees everyone in an equal manner. "No one under the name of Meh can breach the treaty, not a housewife, not a dictator, not an elder, not the homemaker nor a landlord ... " (Yasht 10, Kerde 5). Whether the ruler of a country, whether homeowner or patriarchal leader of a people, nobody has the right to break the treaty at any expense, nobody has legitimacy beyond the social contract to justify his works with *Aorm-hazda* or ..., the actions of the head of state is also under the framework of the treaty and the head of the country also has the right to break the treaty. Incidentally, this Kerde of Mehryasht is in address or better to say warnings to the chairmen and masters. A warning that anyone in the name of misusing Mehr does not have the right to break the treaty. In the Iranian / Zoroastrian community, Iranian kings/clerics could surpass any covenant and humanity under the name of Ahoramazda or the nice world. Zarathustra threatens his opponents with *Taberzin* and contract with his opponents does not mean anything let alone to maintain it? Kings and religious leaders recognized themselves beyond the law and contract to the people in the name of expediency and access to the absolute truth beyond the wisdom of the people, revelation and inspiration. Islam or Zoroastrianism, and even Plato defended white lie and the beneficiary breach of treaty in favour of Islam - Zoroaster / or the truth of the Mosol law. But Mitra warns that no-master has the right to break the treaty under any pretext.

We said that Mitra means contract and treatise, and it considers the most personal human relationships, such as marriage, father and son, to the most megapolitical relations at the state level on the basis of the treaty ... There have not been defined any pre-established principles and rules such as *Alem Mosol*, *Ahoura Mazda* and goodness and ... for Mithra to form political order based on it. The whole political order and social relations must be based on the consent of the parties. The willingness and satisfaction of the parties are the correct and incorrect criterion for the nature of the relationship. It does not regard any unlawfulness and sanctity from the most personal sexual preference to the sanctities and the political red line as governing human relations. There are no preset goodness and badness governing human relationships and the people themselves and it is the consent of the parties with satisfaction that determines what is good and bad. In fact, Mithra annihilated the root of the domination of non-personal generalities (whether metaphysical, social, familial or sexual) on one's individual mentality and personal life. It provided the context for the individual's personal liberation from the

domination of the general religious / metaphysical, social / political, and family / sexual sanctities. The former Mithra meaning the contract is the Median/Kurdish Mithra which has nothing to do with the Persian / Avestan Mithras and the Hindi / Vedic Mithra which has changed into the god of the sun and the goddess of war and .... According to theme, the Iranians and Indians are responsible for the transformation /assimilation of the contract Mithra into Mithra of the goddess of the sun.

Mitra means the contract and it is earlier to Iranian and Indian Mithra and its original residency has been Median and Goutian. In the classical / hierarchical Iranian and Hindu cult society, there is no objective sample of Mithra, and the objective manifestation of Mithra has been realized in the Medes and subsequent Kurdish movements such as Mazdak and Khurdamīn. From the very beginnings of its development, the Iranian society both in its Zoroastrian form and Hachamanid political formations <sup>77</sup> was based on the hierarchy of cosmic order, and the absolute prescriptive principles of Goodness and Ahura Mazda and preconditions for political security was absolute loyalty to these principles and there the king was the mediator of the earth and the sky. In this hierarchical society, the Shah and his subordinates were described as holy / good, and opposition and rebellion as unholy / false and evil. The king was the owner of Fareh Izadi and a the divine right of the king representing the sacred things of Ahura / metaphysics. His judgments decreed as the law and metaphysical sanctity in which all classes and people were submissive to the cause of the king of the land, and interpreted in alliance with his will. The Shah was accountable to Ahuramazda, not the people, and governs his absolute rulings, so he did not need people's satisfaction to be willing to enter into a contract with them. The unity and hierarchy indicated the Iranian society not an agreement and equality.

Hans Peterschmitt believes that "the etymology of the term Mitra meaning contract in India and Iran is shaky because Iran has contacted Mesopotamia from the west and the lack of a general and definitive term for the treaty negates the question of the influence of this culture on Iran and we do not have another efficient cultural nominative in this regard. If we consider the Mithra in the sense of the contract, it is hard to explain its development in Iran, but it can be explained on the basis of alliance. In Rigveda, the meaning of Mitra is the unity of the tribe and shared action against the common enemy meaning unity and each alliance requires loyalty and commitment. This meaning can be imagined as feudal-like relation of the king of Achaemenid with appointed satraps or kings in the form of a loyal and purified relationship between the bigger and the smaller or the sublime. In the culture of India and Iran, Mitra means unity and loyalty neither agreement nor contract. Hillbrandt also believes that the term Mitra does not exist as the contract / treaty in India's oldest works, and in India, Mitra did not have the meaning of the treaty. "(Schmidt, cited in Colska, *ibid*: 409-433). If the standard is the Iranian and Indian society, the Schmidt's suspicion is right but if Schmidt knew the Median community or at least was more careful in king choosing of the Medes as in the case of Diako in Herodotus's account, that doubts about the translation of Mitra into contract would not come about.

Therefore, the Iranian community is based on the master / serf (shepherd / herd in which the shepherd (the king or Zoroastrian/cleric) is representing the absolute truth, that the whole society must observe the loyalty and obedience required of the orders of the clergy and the Shah. But the gothic / material community of <sup>78</sup> was not the crown prints of Haqali and the owner of the forefront, not the regular hierarchy and class society. The rule of the Medes and

Goths can be explained by the theory of contract and popular choice. The material community of the agreement / agreement of the community - as it is from the Hegmataneh, meaning the place of the community - is completely dissolved with the union / loyalty of the Persian - as the Achaemenid means unity. The Hindu / Iranian community, which contradicted the concept of Peymanimatra with the structures of their community, interpreted the main meaning of Mitra and construed it as a loyalty to the Sunni goddess. We will then turn to obedience and loyalty to the transformation of Mithra from the treaty, here it is only noted that in the Zoroastrian religion, in the Achaemenid political system, due to the need for absolute obedience of the people themselves, the content of Mitra from the treaty and mutual agreement Subordinate loyalty to the Shah / clerics, and the hierarchical pact, has meant a commitment to obey. Mitra comes with Varuna in India. Varuna means joining and uniting (Razi, *ibid*: 173). Achaemenid also means unity, but the meaning of the treaty, the hegemony of the community, the notion of a Mithra from the treaty, which was the abstraction of the social / political structure of the Medes, with Persia / Hindi, because of the hierarchy of society, meant the meaning of a treaty to an alliance.

For a better understanding of this topic, it is necessary to have references to seven phases of Mithra. The first stage of the seven phases in which the follower is like a black raven, meaning that the purity from the contamination of the spirit and light and spirituality like the cowkilling ritual along with dance and joy and drunkenness, is held in a dark cave away from the sun. The last stage of the seven-volume Mithra, the seeker, appears in the role of the old man, who is the last stage of emancipation from the soul and the religious / heavenly illusions of earth and human intellect. The old man himself is a social contract. It is read in the mystical Kurdish songs that "Aman Amaneh O' Pier Amaneh Amsho, shawakay ahd-o paymane" (be-ware, beware O' old man beware, tonight is the night of treaty and contract). PirShalyar is the oldest ceremony in Kurdistan, Hawrman which is held in spring and the people are dancing and getting happiness (Sema'e) in it. That is, Pierre Shahriyar or Pir Shah, in this sense as we mentioned before, Shah Madad is elected to the old man by a social contract, like Diaco, according to Herodotus. Diaco is Dave Akwan or Ekwan Dave, nickname of Mitra, which in Shahnameh is the symbol of filthiness and Zoroastrian / Iranianized Rostam, representing the Shah / God, must destroy him. The other meaning of this comes from the village denoting the collection of the villagers. That is, the suppression of the celestial legitimacy or the divine right of the kings are done with a social contract, like the dead body of the Akan Dave and the Ajawidak. The Shah of Iran, unlike the Shah of Mede, is not contracted and legitimized by the people but by God and with the goddess of farhe Izadi.

Mitra: the god of the sun / the sky / god of darkness / Hades?

Before turning to the Mithra, we must clarify that the Yashts, which Mehryast is also a part of it, although being Median and pre-Hachmamanids Zoroastrian but the later Zoroastrian form is molded on it. This latter Zoroastrianism / Persian form of the earlier Mithra is the exaltation / metaphysicalization of the earthly / darkness Mithra. The Zoroastrian Persians built up an artificial Mithra by concealing and destroying the Median Mithral, while the earlier Mithra was a material, not the Sun Mithra, but it was against it, and it was not a metaphysical religion but a land / social religion, and the seven phases- episodes of Mithra are not climbing to the world of the soul and the sky, but to the earth and the body and it is freedom from metaphysical

contamination, which is why the Mithraans celebrated their feasts in darkness and after cowkilling, they attended dancing which is a symbol of the acceptance of the world's tragedy and darkness via Dionysus dance.

In the following chapters, we will look at Yashts and their materiality being (not spiritual and religious) and their Median being (not Iranian or Zoroastrian). Here I just point out that Yashts are describing a non-religious mundane / material civilization-that is more progressive than the eastern Iranian society (Christensen, 1928, in trans by Safa, 1345/1966: 16). Its origin was Dīōyasna which was given Mazdayasn aspect later (Christensen, *ibid*: 17). Yashts, which was embedded in the Avesta collection, is an abnormal element that, due to its earthly and worldly content, does not directly belong to the general text of the Avesta (Avesta), and it is an inappropriate text in comparison to the Avesta text" (Hinz, cited in Dehbashī, 1388/2009: 282). Nonetheless, all the Yashts are not pre-Zoroastrian / Iranian ones and apart from robbery of the old Yasht, many of the Yashts are Zoroastrian later added Yashts. Among the old 8 Yashts (5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19), Yasht 10, i.e. Mehryasht, is the oldest Yashts which even Zoroastrian Mogis have changed the context of this very ancient Yashtan. For information regarding the additives of Yasht 10, Mīrīsh (see Rāzi, 1385/2006: 373 onwards; Rāzi, 1381/2002: 53-54).

With all the later Zoroastrian additions, there are traces of the ancient Yasht remaining in it that represents Mithra. One of the original pieces of Māhrīshat is that Mithra, unlike the direction of the sun, rises after the sunset and sets before dawn. Mithra and the Sun are two separate gods in many religious writings of Pahlavi, Pazand and Mehrist (Vermaseren, 1963, in trans by Naderzād, 1345/1966: 8). Mithra appears on the mountain before the sun..., he is watching when the sun disappears ... its circulation is from the west to the east ... " (Mehryasht, Kerde, 24). Therefore, Mitra has never been the Sun, and is mostly the god of the night and the star rather than that of the sun and the day, and its rising and sunset is the reverse of the sun. After the sunset, Mithra will rise from the west, and he sets in the east before the sunrise. Indeed, the dawn of the sun is the setting of Mithra just as the Persian dawn was the sunset of the Kurds / Medes. Therefore, Mehrl has been neither a religion nor the sun (Ashtiani: 32). Later, he was thought to be the same with the sun becoming significant as the god of the sun (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 9). The oldest indication of the unification of Mithra and the Sun was discovered in Kamazin and Armenia in one century BC and then in the Sassanid, it was also penetrated in the Shahnameh and Iranian mysticism (Ashtiani, *ibid*) 79. Mitra became important as the god of the sun among Parts dynasty (Sundermann, 2002). This connection of Mithra with the sun and worshipping him as the sun was first introduced to the Greeks by Strabo, and Mitra and the Sun were considered to be the same while Strabok describes Mitra in Anatolia, there is no indication that there was Mitra in Anatolia as worshipable god or the sun. So where is the source of Strabo's information (Jong, 1997: 286). The source of Strabok's information comes from the distortion of the contract Mithra and advertisement of Darius and Mogis in depleting the meaning of Median Mithra. Darius announced a call that the Sun and Mitra are eternal and sacred fire. In these propaganda, Darius affirmed the unification of the Sun and Mitra as reality (*ibid*).

In order to prove that Mitra is not the sun but the anti-sun, one can refer, in addition to Mehryasht, to the enmities of the whole world and the images carved from the birth of Mitra inside the rocks. Unfortunately, in Iran, due to the enmity of Zoroastrianism 80 and Darius with the Mitra and the Medes, all the works of Mithra and its enigma have been destroyed (Hinz,



1978, in trans by Rajabi, 1386/2007: 371). We have to refer to other parts of the world, but before that, how did Mithra's birth Turn on the rock of the rock

"In the inscriptions and images obtained from the birth of Mitra (see pictures), Mithra is standing naked on his leg wearing a Frizhi hat, and there is a torch in his left hand and a knife in his right hand (Vermaseren, cited in in Gershevitch, 2011: 93) "With this card, one day, one must kill a bull" (Amozgar, 1385/2006: 124). The first campaign of Mitra is to fight the sun, defeating and kneeling it down after the birth to succeed in his works (Cumon, in trans. by Razi, 1381/2002: 297-304). In the Gats, Mitra is also introduced as the bull-slayer and the defeater of the sun (Zaehner and Lumel, cited in Bianki, Colska, *ibid*: 48). Mithra was not only the sun, but also his main mission was turning against the sun. This is also evident from the torch in his hand. The torch is a symbol of darkness and a cave. The place where there exists the sunlight and brightness, there is n need for the torch. The torch being at the hand of Mitra means he is the god of the dark-ness and his basement world signifies his anti-sun essence. Baivar believes that Mehr has rela-tion with the god of the basement or the world of the Mesopotamian deads, that is, Nergell (Hades) (Hinz, *ibid*: 255).

The anti-sun being of Mitera is clearly evident in the ceremony and the images drawn inside dark caves away from the sun. All sorts of Mehrabs around the world (whether natural or artificial) are made inside a dark cave away from the sun. "Mithraists will worship their god in the dark caves where as if the devilerous darkneses are hidden and escaping from the light and brightness" (Matrinus, cited in Razi, 1381, 274). If Mithra was the god of the Sun, why would they hold their ceremonies and Mehrabes away from the sun in the darkness of the underground caves? "Tartolian" noticed this paradox in his book and "he was surprised that itthey worship the god of light in the dark mehrabes" (Vermaserin, 1345, 59). This para-dox was the result of an objective paradox in the Tortuolian's mind. On the one hand, the Ira-nian solarized Mehr entered the Roma through the military men; on the other hand, the origi-nal covenant Median Mehr was transmittedto Rome through the masses of people. The sym-bols of Roman Mithra ike cowkilling in the dark caves has a fundamental difference with the Persian Mithra (Roger, 2002: 7-20). David Al-Ansi has confirmed that the Roman Mithra is a new interpretation different from the Persian Mithra, and only the name of Mitra is borrowed from Persia in Rome to which they have given a new content (Ullansy, 2011: 30). Mary Boyce has emphasized with awareness on the difference between Roman and Persian Mithra which the Mithra of the Roman Empire has forgotten its Iranian content and they has given a new content to it (Boyce, 1990: 11). This confusion of researchers orginates from those dis-tortions entered in Median content of Mitterah by the Persians who interpreted and changed the meanings of the cave, the dark cave, and the contract as and into the sunworshipping and lightness. Since Rome was closer to Median geography, Median Mithra has symbolically pen-etreated into it sooner and their Mithra did not resemble the recognized Persian Mithra and this has caused the researchers confusion. While the Roman Mithra is not symbolically the contin-uation of the Persian / Zoroastrian Mithra, i.e. the presence in the dark caves and cowkilling, but it is the survival of the prior Median Mithra, and "today, there exists this hypothesis that the Roman Mithraism is derived from the Mede (Bivar, 2005: 343). "But the Roman Mehrabes show the opposition of Mithra to the sun. All in all, the Roman Mehrabes, on the one hand, correctly illustrates Mithra's contrast with the Iranian Mithra and the sun, and on the other hand, they indicate the main nature of the Mithra as it, the earlier median Mithra, has survived through some especial symbolic cermonies such as cowkilling and dark caves among the Kurds of Horami in

Pirhsalayar and Yazidies in Lalesh which none of their example can not be found in Iranian culture.

The star was decorated on the Mehrabe roof in all subterranean Mehrabs and it is very strong paying attention to the stars (Razi, *ibid*; 297-269). Stars are seen only at night, the dawn of the stars is the setting of the sun and sunset is the dawn of the stars. Mehrabes were in the cave away from the sun, and they decorated their ceiling with the stars. It meant that Mithra is the god of night and the star not the god of brightness and the sun. The sun is the one object that monopolize the entire light under his control. However, the stars are so many that each have a part of the light. The numerous stars are the symbol of plurality and the sun is signal of monopoly.

There always can be seen two people called "Kotus" and "Kotopatts on the victim's scene of the bull, in the dark caves (see pictures) in the hands of Mitra. "Happiness of Kotus and the sadness of the Kotopats is quite perceptible (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 104). In Saint Risk temple, Kotus is shown in orange color and Kotopaths in blue color. Kotus has got the glittering torch in his hand and Kotopatsas has got the reversed torch (the same). There has been inscribed the birth scene of Mitra behind the head of the Kotus who has taken the burning torch with his right hand and the image of the star on the rock. The sun has been drawn behind the Kotopats who has taken sadly the reversed torch with his left hand (Razi, 1381, 289). What do Kutos' happiness, orange color and burning torch and Kotopats' sorrow, blue colored and upside down torch signify?

Vermaseren follows the Francesco, although it describes the images as well as the motifs in their midst, but they are in the analysis of the head of Turkestan. Vermaseren sees the rising torch of Kotus rising from the sun and the rising torch of the Kotopaths as the sunsets. (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 104) But how much is the fact of Vermaseren's analysis? We used to say that the sunrise and the sunset were insoluble in the sun and all appear at sunset after sunset, that is, the god of night and darkness, which is also well represented in these veils, contrary to the analysis of Vermaseren. The torch is lit up with the right hand, behind it is the image of the star is closed and behind the Kotopats, which holds the flare upside down, the image of the sun is closed. The star is the symbol of the sunset and the night. Bonab This, the burning torch of Kotus during the cattle sacrifice, the dawn of the miter and the sunset, is that the sun is burning - and the Kotopats with the upright torch, the miter's sunset, and the rising sun. The miter's birth scene is alongside the role of the star, behind Kotus, the birthday / Tolo (sunrise) of Mithra is shown at sunset and in the starry night. The Kotus are orange and kotopats blue in color, orange is sunset, always at sunset, colored to The orange appears on the sunset horizon, so the color of the orange Cotes that holds the burning torch is the symbol of the sunset, which is the Mithrometallot, the blue color indicates the glow of the sun in the sky and its ascension when the sun ascends and its radiation, The sky becomes blue. In the night sky is dark. So, the blue color of the Kotopats is sad with the torch inverted, due to the rising sun, behind which the image of the sun is closed.

However, what does the joy of Cotes and the sadness of the Kutopatts signify? Whatever they are, the essence of Kotus and the Kotopats are not presently known to us; though, they are Mitra's companions. The flaming torch represents the sunrise and reversed torch signifies the sunset and the downfall. Kotus that has the burning torch in the right hand is shown as gladly but Kotopatts, who has the upright torch on the side of the sun in his left hand, is sad that he

has made his right hand as the pillow for his face. This means that when Mithra is rising, the sunsets and the Mithras' companions are glad. On the contrary, in the dusk of Mitra, which is the dawn of the sun, Mithra is shown with the reversed torch at the hand of Kotoyates, the companions of Mithra are grieved and sad. The sunrise and sunset of Mitra shown with two igniting and upside down torches are exactly the opposite directions of the sunrise and the sunset. Therefore, Kotopathus's reluctance, contrary to Vermaseren's statement, is not due to the reluctance to participate in the cowkilling scene, but it indicates the end of the victim, the mithra's sunset, and the rising sun. Since the image of the Kotopathus is in-crusted with a torch inverted below the sun and this fact that he has held the cow with one hand in an upright manner, it means that the Mithra's sunset will be the rebound of the sun and the resurrection of the cow

Another proof for attesting Mitra's anti-sun being is that Mithra has been shown in the lilly flower in some of the images of the birth of Mitra (Razi, *ibid*: 272 ). Niloofar flowers blossom before the dawn and as soon as the first rays of the sun's light is set, they fade away (Dehkhoda, cited in Wikipedia). Consequently, contrary to the analysis of Hashem Razi who describes Mitra's birth from Niloofar as Mithra's association with the sun and it shows the Mitra's opposition to the sun when Mithra – Lilly- blossoms with the sunset and it fades away when it is dawn of the sun. Even today, there are a large number of Niloofar (lilly) flowers picturized on the walls of the Yazidi Kurds temple in Laleh who, as Mar says, they are symbolically the most aboriginal Kurds of the region. Look at the pictures.

But why were all the Mithraian ceremonies inside a rocky cave, and "their Mehrabs was often underground" (Razi, 1381/2002: 36) which they even would make, even if they did not have access to natural caves, symbolic caves under the ground in such a way that light and light and brightness would not penetrate through it? (Porphyre, cited in Razi, *ibid*: 273).

Moses Khourni writes: "the old women narrate that he (Mehr) is imprisoned in a cave, Mehr is cluttered and chained and two dogs chew chains and he tries to escape and end the life of the world, but the chains become tighter with the sound of the blacksmith ... "(Khourni, cited in Boyle, *ibid*: 100).

In Iranian mythology, Ajidak / Zahak, is not killed after being captured by Fereydoun and is imprisoned and chained in a cave in Damavand (Safa, 1384/2005: 462). Ibn Asir narrates that: "Fereydoun met with Solomon bin Dawud. He was jailed in Damavand. Solomon told to chain him so he could not move. Then, two men beat the gate in the cave and Ajidak was imprisoned forever because he will not die. "(Ibn Asir, 1385/2006: 1/ 81). Cyrus also made Astyagh survive after giving up and imprisoned him and fastened him in shackles (Ctesias, Photius, 1379/2000: 19).

After defeating the devil and the seven demons, Ahura Mazda along with his seven Andamshaspandan kept the devil alive and imprisoned him in a hole / cave. "They took the devil ... they stuck him in a hole on the Minoee rope, two angels of Ordibehesht and Vahram stood as his guard. If anyone says that all this suffering is from Demon, why you did not kill him ..." (Razi, 1381/2002; 295). Abdullah Bin Omar said a man from Iran's Arabs led Nimrod to burn Abraham saying that whether Iranians also had Arabs. They replied that the Kurds were their Arabs. A person whose name was Hizen, who was one of the Kurds who said that burn

Abraham- Gharbi, had been immersed into the earth until the Day of Resurrection (Ibn al-Asir, *ibid*: 108)

Afrasiyab was living in a haven in the middle floor of the land called Hence (Safa, *ibid*: 618). After being defeated near Bardea, he sheltered in a cave. The Afrasiab's regiment which was the underground devilish palace became the cave in *Shahnameh* (Mafred Kahlan, 1375/1996: 37 – 36). This regiment, the Afrasyab underground palace, is the same temple of Qasba and Vahra (Mafred Kahlan, *ibid*: 66).

It is precisely near Damavand that Mithra was standing on his feet, and this is the mountain that Fereydoun imprisoned Ajidahak that he would be killed by Gershasb at the end of the world (Russell, in trans by Dehbashi, *ibid*: 77).

Hertzfeld and Hinzat considered Sagartias as one decedents of the Kurds. The Sagarathians led the Mede revolt against the Persians after Fara-Wertysh. Sagartia consists of two parts of the stone and the cave meaning "rock cave" (Hinz, 1386/2007: 433) that the meaning of the cavemen can be deduced from the word Sagarita (Eiler, 1940: 7).

Gurgen's Medusa also lives in a cave in Greek mythology in the underground world of Hades. The inhabitants of the Plato cave have also been chained to their legs and necks (Copleston, 2003, in trans by Khoramshahi, 1388/2009: 190).

The Mehrabe or temple of Yazidian Kurd is also a dark cave in the underground where they illuminates the torch and have hung the symbols of the justice scale.

In the following chapters, we will come up with a comprehensive description of the implementation of these myths together and in relation to the Kurds, and we will say that Turanian

Afrasyab, Ažidakk / Zahhak, Mitra / Mehr, Medusa, all have common characteristics and the references of all of them are Kurds. Here, we just mention the dimension of their being in the cave. The cave in all political wisdom of ancient nations is a symbol of darkness that would be defined against the truth, brightness and light of the sky and the sun. "The inhabitants of the Plato's cave are the people who live in a state of hesitation and thought. They only see the shadows of reality. Because of their lusts and prejudices, they are inclined to be perverted and deviant, their situation is not better than the situation of children, who, if they come to the world of the truth light, they will get blinded by the brightness of the light, and they see the shadows much more real than the realities. The transition from the dark world of the cave to the world of light and fire is the transition from the world of prejudice and lust and soph-istry to the real world of consciousness, and then to the reasonable and truth world. The sun represents an example of goodness and the supreme appearance and the source of truth and reason "(Copleston, *ibid*: 191-190). But how much does Plato's words have referents?

Nietzsche has accused Plato of being hostile to this world and building a transcendental universe for being hostile to this world, and hating human life from presuppositions and moral interests (Nietzsche, quoted from Copelston, the same., *Nietzsche Along with Freud and Marx*, the whole metaphysical philosophy, God, truth, morality, religion, etc., is considered to be a false consciousness or escape from reality. Nietzsche is the whole of truth, intellect and ethics, from Socrates to Hegel, language and instrument of will Power, and under the concept of apollo, zinc And the illusion is that it is due to the weakness of mankind in dealing with the

tragic reality of existence. Tragic reality, which, instead of the illusion of reason and religion, was to be welcomed by the Dionysius dance, so if mankind could really deal with the tragic truth of being, to dream And the illusion of reason and ethics, or of God and the world, does not shelter. Therefore, unlike Plato, who views the inhabitants of the cave as a symbol of childish imagination and imagination, it is the same truth. The truth of the world is tragic, and throughout the whole (C) is and sorrow and inequality.

The political reasoning of Greece (Plato), Iran (Zoroaster) and other nations sought refuge in the dream, the sun and the world of Mosol and Ahura Mazda to escape the tragic reality of the world, as a child who escapes from the principle of reality to the dreams in his own mind. The Kurds (Mithras, Zahhak, etc.) embraced the bases of the tragic reality and its bitterness of darkness with a dance of dionizosy, joy and cheerfulness and not like the philosophy to seek shelter in the illusion of Autopia, not similar to religion to have hope in the other world and not like mystic to resort to the mysteries of their own mind. Darkness and darkness of the cave are the symbol of darkness of the world and the sun and the universe of Mosol and Ahuramazda and ... are the symbol of childish dreams to overcome the tragic truth. Those who are so accustomed to beautiful but empty illusion of sunlight and fire are not able to enter the dark cave because their eyes are so much accustomed to the light and have lived with its dreams that they are not willing to wake up and see the truth of the world that the cave is a symbol of it.

The only retrieved texts regarding Mithraism is in the Roman Saint Prisk in 220 in which the teachings of the Mithraism rite revolves around the axis of the problems after the followers and after defining the followers of the religion and faith towards cooperation, it is written that: "the stew made from the poultry liver is quite delicious, but what is ruling on our life are the concern prevailing our minds ... "(Vermaseren, *ibid*: 238) which is the same definition of Nietzsche of Dionysus. Dionysus does not deny the hardness and the tragedy of life but welcomes with happiness instead of taking refuge in dream and delusion and eating the pill of the next world and God. Marists "are aware of the concerns and worries of the life" but they receive life with Homa (wine) and dancing.

In one of the images drawn from Mitra (see pictures), Mitra rides on a chariot that the horses push it forward, but Mitra, unlike the chariot direction, looks behind himself. In many other images, Mitra is watching behind not at the cow when he is killing it. It has a very tragic meaning, which I would like to interpret it through the analysis of Walter Benjamin who saw the tragedy of the killing of Jews in his own eyes. Benjamin interprets the contrast between progress and tragedy on the basis of this picture, but Benjamin is not aware that his image is Mithra's and he thinks it is an angel. Benjamin sees the angel / mithra's moving ahead with the horse and breeze as positive concepts, progress, and paradise, and he considers Mithra's looking back contrary to the direction of the breeze and the horse's carriage, and zooming to a point in the back as seeing tragedies like Auschwitz. This means that from the religions up to Nazism all with the slogan of the progression and realization of autopia and classless communism just created the crises and passed their foot on blood and bodies. Thus, the chariot looking forward is the same slogans of progression and autopia, and Mithra's turning back and zooming behind is seeing the tragedy of life such as Auschwitz and Halabche and Shin-ge, Mithra does not have any hopes in the utopian illusions and he has not understand the tragedy of life well. In other images, Mitra has zoomed into the sun while killing a cow, looking behind and becoming triumphant over it. Although he is killing the heavenly illusions and the slogans

of paradise and utopia, he knows well that his looking at the sun behind him means that the sun will be resurrected and in the name of its light, the Ashe, the Ahura and the Anfal of the Qur'an, they carried out the tragedies such as Anfal, Halabja, Shingle and Massacre of Medians.

Kurd Mithraists / who have understood and accepted the tragedy, instead of escaping from it and rejoicing in the illusion of the dream of the sun and the world of beauty, they go to the darkness of the cave, which is a symbol of the darkness of the world dancing and cheering in Dionesean merriness by eating wine and meat and sacrificing / killing the cow and the sun, which is a symbol of its heavenly fantasies. Therefore, it is Plato and his likes who seek refuge in childish imaginations, illusions and dreams, and they escape the truth of the world, not the inhabitants of the caves and Mithraians. They described political intellect as of Plato / Zoroastrian logos / metaphysics, and ... Erotic intellect / Kurds / the Mithraans as illusions, Satan, etc., while its origin was due to jealousy of the whims of Mithras and its deprivation and the world of Mosol and supreme truth, and ... are just painkillers to overcome reality.

However, Nietzsche could not escape this trap with all the criticisms and raids on metaphysical philosophy, from Plato to Hegel. Nietzsche's book *Zoroastrianism* begins with the narrative of three metamorphoses: "How does a soul become a camel, a camel become lion, and finally the lion become a child? a camel is an animal that carries loads: the burden of established values, the burden of education, the burden of ethics and the burden of culture and when the camel becomes the lion: The lion breaks the statues, kicks at the loads and criticizes all the established values. Finally, the lion's fate is to become a child, a game and a new beginning, the creator of new values and principles of evaluation (Deleuze, 2003: 27). When coming out of the cave, the Zoroaster's lion is roaring towards the cave, i.e. he has moved away the Zoroaster's old thoughts and values to reborn Zoroaster. Nietzsche's paradox is the same. Nietzsche, on the one hand, speaks around "the redness of shame on Plato's cheek" and the scandal of philosophy, on the other hand, talks about the lion's roar is to the direction of the cave. It means Nietzsche like Plato falls in the trap of the philosophy of lighting / metaphysics and considers the cave as the symbol of superstition and anti-truism. The paradox of Nietzsche's Zarathustra is so evident that he wrote "Zarathustra.

Heidegger correctly states that: Oh, Nietzsche, the last metaphysician, the sky is the same over the bridge. Where you want to escape the heavy burden of metaphysics. Nietzsche did not know that he has stayed with a lion roaring towards the cave in the trap of Plato's philosophy. Nietzsche, if he wanted to introduce Zoroastrians other than the historical / Iranian Zoroastrians, the lion's rage would have to be towards the heaven and metaphysical horror, not a cave, which is a symbol of the tragic nature of truth and darkness. To understand the tragic truth of the universe, one would have to put aside the illusion of the sun and go into a dark cave away from the metaphysical solar / heavenly dreams. Nietzsche showed a special skill in introducing Zarathustra as a serious initiator of the Apollonian illusion, but for recognizing his antithesis, Dionysus, he went astray. The Dionysian dance is the same as the Mithraean dance and drunkenness in the darkness of the cave during cowkilling, the same as Kurdish Hellperke (dancing).

Therefore, Mithra is neither the sun, nor the sun-worshipping, but it is its antithesis, and the earlier Mithraism ritual held away from the sunlight in the dark caves, in the basement, and with animals like snake and scorpion. The snake and the scorpion do not fly to heaven, but their shelters are going into the basement, and the water springs inside the Mithraism caves are also

a symbol of land and anti-metaphysics; the water route, like that of the snake and the scorpion, is downward. It was against this Mithraist ceremony that Zoroastrianism and Plato revolted; they sanctified fire against the water and the sun, and the brightness against darkness, and they sanctified cow and eagle in contrast to the serpent and scorpion, the Great, the Eagle and the cattle, and constructed religion, and moral standards against dance and drunkenness.

- Mitra: cow and eagle or snake and scorpions and lion?

We said that Mithra meant the contract in origin, and it meant Hades denoting the antisun and the symbol of darkness and the underground world, Hades. Its main meaning has been forgotten in the Iranian / Indian culture, and its antithesis meaning, the god of the Sun, was molded on it. Mitra has also been transformed into another type and other form of Mithrahas been molded on it. Before that I should indicate that the contrast between the earth and the sky, human intellect and divine and metaphysical intellect has always been expressed in symbolic forms. The snake and milk symbolize the human intellect, the earth and the body in contrast to the cow and the eagle that represent the transcendental intellect or the divine law, and the sky and spirituality. It means that Mithra's assassination of the cow turned into a cow's sacrifice for the revival of the divine order in the Iranian / Zoroastrian ex-termination culture. Mithra was the everlasting company of the serpent and scorpion which are the symbol of earth and human intellect, not the cow and the eagle that symbolize the spirit and metaphysics and divine law. Therefore, the main mission of Mitra after capturing the sun was to kill the cow.

The main mission of Mitra has been to kill the holy cow "(Zaehner, Lumel, Beyanki, cited in Closka, 1385/2006: 48). Indeed, the most surprising adventure about Mitra is the fight with the first bull (Razi, 1381, 304). In all the inscriptions and works remaining from Mithraism in the dark caves, Mitra is busy killing the cow (see the images of Mitra) surrounded by a snake "(Von Gal, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 578). Snakes, scorpions and the lion are the symbol of Mithraism "(Closka, *ibid*: 15). Unlike Zoroastrianism, in Mithraism snake is good (Razi: 1381/2002: 439).

Mitra is killing a cow, but the Iranianized Mithra has turned it into a sacrifice for the reinstatement of the celestial order 82. However, the reality is that this is not sacrifice, but killing and fighting with the cow. "Ernest Will" in the essay "The Origin and Nature of Mithra's Death" rightly raised this question whether this is the bull-slaying or killing and fighting with a cow? "Everybody ever used the word of Mithraic sacrifice, but does it really connote a sacrifice in these images? ... The victim is done and the cow sacrifice has put his left knee on the back of the cow and ... enters a stick on the shoulder of the cow, this scene does not match the actual scene of the true sacrifice ... the leg of the godfather on the back of the bull ... which the conqueror trampled down his leg as a sign of victory over his opponent foot in many scenes. Hector approaches Patroklos from the rear to kill him and pulls his head back-wards ... or Hercules puts his left leg on the right foot of the opponent to kill him so it has not been sacrifice but it has been the fight (similar to Cyrus foot over Gaomatta-Qaderi) ... Kill-ing an oriental At the hands of a Macedonian is similar to cowkilling scene ... The conqueror puts the conquered's head down on the ground, his leg on his foot, pulls his head back and puts the sword into his shoulder and... " (Will, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 584 - 583). Therefore, as Will has described correctly This is not the act of sacrificing but killing of the cow and fighting with the cow.

According to Von Gall, the sacrifice (killing) of the cow in many scenes contrasts with the religion of the Iranians who oppose the sacrifice of the cows, the Iranians know devil as the killer of the cow (Von Gall, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 574).

Nonetheless, what the goal of Mitra and Mitraians was in killing the cow. To find the answer to this question, we must understand the symbolic meaning of the cow. In all religious / metaphysical cultures, from India and Egypt to Iran and Assyria, cow is seen as a sacred and heavenly animal 83. Cows or bulls are "the symbol of the sky and the heavens in the metaphysical cultures " (Wichdress, Colosska, the same, 200). It is the symbol of the Divine law against human intellect. The first holy creature created by Ahuramazda along with Kiomars was a sacred cow. The cow symbolizes the celestial of the Ahuramazda. The incarnation of Fereydoun, Zoroastrians, Kiapioh and ... transmitted to their mother's yeast through the cow's milk. "Zoroaster's Ferohar was transmitted through the milk. Based on the narrative of Zat Spermay, the Zoroastrian's Ferohar was transmitted via sacred plant named Hom. That plant transmitted into the cow's milk, Zarathushtra father milked it, and thereby was taken to the Zartosht's mother "(Razi, 28: 1380). Cow along with the eagle has been the Iranian totem (Briant, 2006: 12).

The Kavian flag is also rooted in the cow bark (Safa, 1384/2005: 572) 84. Therefore, killing the cow is the defense of the earth and the human body and intellect against the spirit and the heavens and divine and godly laws. Herzfeld's archeological findings confirm the worship of the snake in Madh; the snake has been the totem of some of the local tribes of Mede, and the Medes are introduced as the sons of snake in the old texts (Alif, 2009, 456)

Among other symbols of Mitra is the lion; in metaphysical religions, the lion is a symbol of evil and filthy. Unlike most of the symbols and facies in Persepolis which involve the cow, one of the few remaining traces of the Medes is a stony lion (Grishman, cited in Ziapour, *ibid*: 121). Thus, the totems of the Medes, which will be further elaborated in the following chapters were the snake / dragon and the lion, against the totems of Persians, i.e. the eagle and the bull. The lion and the snake are the symbols of the human wisdom and the earth, and the eagle and the cow are the symbol of the dome of heaven and the divine law that Rostam and Esfandiar each have to fight with the lion and the snake (dragon) in their thread and thimbles (Safa, 1384/2005: 597), while in Mitra's thread and thimbles, number four, Mithra has been depicted in the form of lion and the body of snake (see pictures)

"In all the inscriptions and artifacts left behind as the memorials of Mitra, it shows Mitra along with the snake, scorpion, and lion while hunting, killing and fighting with the cow, " (Varmaseren, *ibid*: 95; Razi, 1981/2002: 161-306). The snakes and scorpions are the Mehrist symbolic (Closka, *ibid*: 15). At the ritual of the Mithraists, those achieving the special position of the lion are in the front line (Razi, the same, 279).

When slaughtering a cow, accompanying him (Mitra) the snake sticks the cow and the scorpion presses the testicles of the cow. "Pressing the testicle of the cow by scorpion refers to the action of the devil to take the cow and to destroy the generation of the creation in the world ...; the scorpion and the serpent ... are introduced as the evil beasts and the messengers of evil in Bandehish" (Varmaseren, *ibid*: 99). Snake versus eagle symbolizing the heaven, is the symbol of the earth (Phongall, the Colosca, the same, 571), the instinct and human intellect. The serpent that directs Eve to eat the fruit of knowledge (Torah / Bob III, cited in Maskob, 1385/2006:



14), that the man became self-cognizant regarding good and evil and needless of God's commandments and law in contrast to cow and eagle are the signs of divine law and superhuman intellect.

Apart from the fact that the animals accompanying the Mitra are lion, snake and scorpion, the "Mitra himself is shown in many ancient symbols with the human body, the head of the lion and with the dragon / snake around it" (von Gaal, closka, *ibid*: 565; Razi, 1381/2002: 298). In most of the inscriptions, Mehr is in the form of the head of the lion, which is the connotation of the devil and the name of the satan in Zoroastrian religion" (Hinelz, 128: 1385). Zener and Duchon-Gaiman have called this picture as the evil (Varmazren, the same, 158). leg, Dushan Gimand and others believe that the devil is the same as Mitra or Zoroasterian demon. (Hensman, Closka, *ibid*:255). The demon with the lion's head is the king of the devilish world (Zaehner, cited in Von Gall, *ibid*: 571). In a picture in Berlin, a giant with lion's head is fighting with Iter, the god of the bright sun. Therefore, the lion-head giant is among the enemies of the gods of light, and the god of the darkness (Von Gal, Closka, *ibid*: 570 ) which we already explained in the discussion concerning the Mithraism cave and the philosophy of darkness as the symbol of the life tragedy and loyalty towards the earth.

In the area of Troy ... Mitra is born in the heart of the cliff with a snake surrounding around her body, Mary has ringed. ... in the civilian region of an Orphus ...a snake has circled around a naked youngster and there is a lion on the breast of Mitra "(Varmaseren, *ibid*: 167-168) in a palace in Rome, there is a statue reminiscent of the Mehrism ritual .... This is the statue of Kronos standing up with a lion-shaped head and a pair of wings like the Eon ... the images of the lions and not the snake is circling round it, but two snakes are rising on both sides of it. There is also a three-headed dog, a dragon and a head of a lion on the trunk of the tree ... like Mithra "(Vermaseren, *ibid*: 172). Pentazoni has proved the presence of the three-headed dog indicating the relationship of this God with the Egyptian serapis. (Varmaseren, *ibid*: 172). In Wallbrook, scenes of gods such as Mitra have been painted from Athena marble and Serapis snake in a scene (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 282). In Egyptian culture, the cow and the sun are holy, the snake of Serapis is the symbol of Hades and the world of darkness. Pharaoh, after ascension to heaven, comes into being by one of the gods in the form of a cow and the guardian of the heavenly realm of the sun is a brilliant bull (Razi, 1381, 462). Great Nile serpent (Serapis) is able to swallow the rays of the sun during a solar eclipse (Razi, *ibid*: 458). Zahhak as well as Mithra is depicted with two snakes on their shoulders and three head. The Medes became also known as Zahak, snake-shouldered, three headed, and six muzzles (Aliev, *ibid*: 172). In the inscription obtained in France ... The name of lion-headed god is described as satanic devil; thus, there is no doubt that the lion-headed god is the same as devil "(Von Gal, *ibi*: 573). Of course, the devil is the molded form of metaphysical religions over evil. In Mede, it has had no title of devil and evil, since goodness and evil had basically no meaning. Metaphysical religions were a rebellious against darkness, earthliness, human intellect, contract, and Mithra's cowkilling with the symbol of light and heaven, the sanctification of the cow and the divine law and they made Mithra known as devil and evil that was a positive and terrestrial concept in Mithraism and I will address later in the discussion of the advent of Zarathustra.

Beside the snake and the lion and scorpion, another animal that is always accompanying Mitra is a black crow. Mitra enters a rock cave with the guidance of a black crow (Boyle, Keloska, the same, 90). Mithra finds the cow escaping from the cave with the help of a crow (Razi,

1381/2002: 200). The crow is the reminiscent of the cow-killing (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 101). A follower who has achieved the secrets of the Mithra's rituals puts on a mask similar to a crow (Vermaseren, *ibid*). The black raven has a lot of significance in the ceremony and religion of Mitra and only the black raven, not white, yellow, and luminous. Despite the viewpoints of internal (Razi) and external scholars (Vermaseren), the crows are not the messenger of the sun for the cowkilling, but Mithra's messenger to transmit the news of cowkilling not cowsacrificing to the sun. The black crow is the symbol of the darkness and the Hades world, it is a crow sitting on the crescent's edge of a cave conotating that it is flying towards God and bringing a message to be heard (Vermaseren, *ibid*: 101). It is hearing a message from Mitra in the dark world of Hades, to God and the bright world of the sun, indicating the destruction of creators and celestial symbols (cows), and the continuity of creators and earthly ordinances (snake and black ravens).

Though the crow is a bird and flying, but unlike the eagle, it is the symbol of the earth and its darkness; it is anti-sun and symbolizes the darkness and the darkness of the Hades world. The crow is guiding Mithra inside the dark cave. It does not let the cow escape from the cave. The black crow is guiding the killers' father, Ghabil for burial of Abel. The eagle is the symbol of the dome of the sky (De Rich Vares, Closka, *ibid*: 200). The eagle representing the heavens and Zeus, every day, eats the Prometheus liver rebelling against the gods. In contrast to the snake symbolizing the earth, the instinct, the fear and sexual rebellion is the eagle which is the symbol of the soul's liberation from the body, the sky, and the metaphysical thoughts. The lower part of the Ahuramazda is in the form of an eagle, and Ferehizadi always depends on the bird of the eagle type (Shahbazi, *ibid*: 341). In contrast, the black ravens is the special bird of Mitra (Gershwich quoting Bonfan Elo, Closka, *ibid*: 82). In the preface to *Also sprach Zarathustra*, when Nietzsche indicates that the goal of this book is to break the dualism of the earth/instinct versus the sky and the soul, he writes: "I saw the eagle and the snake as two friends". There, he considers the eagle as the symbol of the divine / metaphysical thoughts and the snake as the symbol of earthly / physical thoughts. In the story of the Eagle and the Crow, which Khanleri also wrote in poetry: The Eagle asks the malicious raven the secret of long life, immortality and health. "What is the resource of this long life?", the crow regards the secret of immortality and health of the crows and the eagle's burnout as due to the superiority of the earth and the earth's wind on the sky and the heavenly wind:

Nothing comes down from the sky. What is the goal of all these flights?

When the winds are bleezing under the ground. they do not pollute the soul and the flesh

The more you get out of the ground, the higher the winds and their harm and losses

To the point where the peak of the heaven. The sign of the death becomes the decay's courier

We have got a lot since that very year. We have turned away from the height

The raven desire is towards the lowland. Owing to it, it has acquired its long life

Therefore, the crow is a special bird of mitra, not the courier of the sun, but the messenger of the dark world of Hades to the sun. In Iranian mythology, it is interesting that the Achaemenid the ancestor of Achaemenids was grown up by an eagle (Cook, *ibid*: 282). The eagle fed

Achaemenid and the relationship of the eagle with the royal power of Pars has often been confirmed (Briant, *ibid*: 169). As it was said that the FereIzadi of the royal crowns and the shape of Ahura Mazda have always shown in the form of an eagle. Besides, in Mazdaism ritual, the Ahoori bird, the rooster, is the company of Soroush's godfather against the de-mons, the malice of the fire goddess (Razi, 1381/2002: 444). In Mithraism, the rooster is beheaded when the Zoroastrians expect it to spread the Divan through its songs at dawn. They sacrifice the rooster at the Mehregan celebration. People sacrificed the cock at dawn of the Nowruz dawn the sun was rising up to the 4th century in Bukhara (the same;444). In contrast to Razi's viewpoint this is not a sacrifice, but it is killing that prevents the dawn from becoming known. Mithraism is the ritual of night and darkness. The cock symbolizes the end of the night and the beginning of the day's light. Thus, they behead the cock in order not to announce the end of the night. Today, among the Ahle- Haq Kurds (Ghalakhani), the ceremony is still alive and carried out.

In the mythological culture of Iran, there exist two primary creatures called Meshi and Meshyane that play the same role of the symbol of Adam and Hawa in the Sami / Islamic culture in Iran. They come into existence from the plant 'rhubarb'. Thus, Rhubarb should be considered a holy plant in the mythological culture of Iran from which all of their ancestors have been born. We (the Kurds), as in the past, call Rhubarb as "Qalaqan" (in Persian, the anus of the Crow or the Crow's anus). We name the Iranian holy plant from which the heaven-only and paradise Meshi and Meshyane as the ravenous raven or the anus of the black crow. What is sacred to the metaphysical culture of Iran is what we describe with the lowest and most discursive words. Just like the things that have been described as sacred in the culture of geodynamics / Kurds, such as being terrestrial, the preference of instinct and body over the soul and the preference of land / contract legitimacy over divine law, and so on as Ajaydak, Ahriman, and others. The values of the Iranians and the Kurds are against each other.

Based on the material previously mentioned about the earth / underground (Hades) and anti-sun / sky, and that the sacred animals of snake and scorpion and lion accompanying Mithra which are the symbol of evil in all religions, what are the aim of Mithra at killing a cow that is his main mission?

Mithra's goal to kill the cow, contrary to the opinion of some researchers, is to destroy the celestial order and heavenly creation. If Mithra is a solar / Zoroastrian Mithra, and his action is not killing the cow, but the sacrifice for cosmic renewal and the creation of life, how are evil animals like snakes and scorpions present at the scene of the cow sacrifice? Mithra is the devil of the Zoroastrian religion, who killed the holy cow and Kiumars. Mitra is an earthly / physical religion that resists the metaphysical / spiritual wisdom of Ahura Mazda and his ability. He tried to establish a worldly order or defended the earth's order against the invasion of metaphysical order through destroying the galaxy order. Zarathushtra understood the issue far more than the contemporary historians that nicknamed Mithra and the cow-killer as devil. Zarathushtra was the prophet of metaphysics and heavenly illusions and the spirit and the law who termed the earthly, physical, and rational Mithra as the devil whom I am referring to below.

It is worth knowing that cowkilling ceremonies are still unknowingly remaining in among Izadi Kurds and Pirshalayar in Horaman and Yarsansan, although they have taken Zoroastrian / Islamic meaning. Besides, the image of the snake is inscribed on the port of the temple in Lalesh and the picture of the lion is depicted on the port below the image of Melek Tawoos; moreover,

the picture of the scorpion and the dog are drawn on the walls of the building, the same scorpion and the dog and the mother which are always accompanying Mithra while killing the cow (look at Mitra's cow killing pictures at the end of the book).

- Mitra: spiritual / divine or terrestrial / physical ritual?

Mitra, as the Medi culture and ritual, has never been a religion, not a praiseworthy god. Mitra / Contract was the social / political culture of the Medes/Kurds that was later abstracted, on the one hand to Ahriman and on the other hand as the sun of god in Iranian / Indian culture. We will refer in the following discussions to how Mithra was turned into hated evil and a glorious omen in Iranian / Zoroastrian culture. Here, in continuing the previous discussions, we argue that Mithra was not a religious, spiritual ritual, but a physical / earthly and social one. We are addressing those who regard - later we will discuss it - that the mystical / Islamic culture and the seven phases of the freedom of the soul from the Islamic / Iranian body are based on the ritual of Mithra. It's somehow true, but with a different meaning. The purpose of the Mithra and its seventh phases is to reverse the seventh phases of Islam. As the rising and setting of the Mithra is the inverse of the sunrise and sunset and later it became distorted and identical to the sun, meaning that the mission of the seven phases of Mithra is the release of the body / flesh from the dirt of the sky / soul. In contrast, the purpose of the seven Islamic / mystical phases is to free the soul from the cage of the body / earth. We are certain to say what the modern postmodernists especially Foucault were thinking about was practiced centuries ago by the Kurds / Mitraians, that "the spirit is the cage of the body." For example, in the fourth phase of the seven-phases of Mitra, the seeker turns into the form of a lion, but in seventh phase in Iran / Zoroastrian, for example, in Shahnameh, Esfandiar should kill the lion in the fourth phase. This means the concept of confiscation, but it has been emptied from the earthly meaning and it has acquired the divine meaning. Mithra is the earthly, physical ritual; therefore, it became "the other" of all metaphysical religions and philosophers.

Hots 9 to 11 are called HomYasht. In fact, these three hots were from the Yashts who changed them in the form of Zoroastrianism and placed them among the Hots of Yasna (Razi, 1381/2002: 114). From the article 19th to 23rd In these three Hots, the ancient elements of the Mithra Yasht have been quoted. These three hots are referring to the beauty of the physical / terrestrial elements and disbelief in the spirit and the other world in Mitra in which some demands are made from Hom all related to this world and body and flesh, "Hom is beautiful and healing ... death repeller ...asking for the best of life and comfort ... requesting health for the body, the third request of a long life for flesh - the Oshane which disappears with material body"(Homyasht, cited in Razi, ibid: 115). The demand for long life for the body from Hom in mithra ritual is made because body is removed with the death of material flesh and it does not have any belief in the soul after the removal of the flesh. If they believed in the survival of the soul after the death, they did not ask for the life long of the flesh because the soul does not die so as to demand a long life for the flesh. Since the flesh and the soul are together in Mithra, the soul does not exist after the removal of the body. In Mithraism, the soul dies after the body and there is no belief in the world afterlife or the other world. There is no soul and soul dualism in Mithraism existing in Zoroastrianism, Plato, Mani, Christ, and so on. Further, the best living, comfort and health are requested for the body. We also do not deny existence of such requests in other religions, but the main emphasis in all religions and ancient

cultures is on the comfort of the soul not the body. The body is mortal and the cage of the soul. Ayub, who undergoes all physical / terrestrial disasters, is a complete symbol of the religious / metaphysical cultures in such a way that the life of this world does not have any values in itself and is merely an instrument of salvation of the soul and the Hereafter. The world is the field of the Hereafter. In the Zoroastrian religion, the human body is an instrument in the service of the soul and the reason; an instrument serving the transfer-ring of the Ahoorian religion (Zaehner, 1377/1998:s22). "After the creation of Meshi and Meshyane ..., Hurmozd said: "First, the soul was created, and then the body ... the body was created for the soul, and the body is the instrument of the soul (the emphasis is mine me - Ghaderi) that would make it work ... Hormoz in address to Meshi and Mashine: ... You are the best crea-tures from the viewpoint of ration and propagate the basis of religion ... under the guidance of ration" (Pirnia, 1376/1997: 14). It means that wisdom is the tool and the interpreter of religion, not the self-foundational.

In the Goths, we also find that Zoroaster demands receiving introspection and the mystical – Ishraghi vision (Razi, 1381/2002: 114). The Ishraq wisdom is realized in Zoroastrianism (Razi: 1380/2001: 18). Zoroaster asked Hormozd: O, creator of the materialistic world and the manifesta-tion of heavenly discourse What is good for the salvation in the later world ... in the material world ... to triumph over evil ... . Ahuramazda said that O, Zoroaster it is remembering and deep thinking in my names and Amosaspandan, which will bring about salvation in the mate-rial world and the next world, and will lead to well-being and overcoming evil in the material world and salvation of that world" (Razi, 1380: 343). However, in Mehryasht the bliss does not come about through worshiping gods, thinking and soul but it is the salvation of the body and it is the basis for applying for the best living and health of the body, and there is no sign of the salvation of the soul and hereafter life and the mystical intuition.

The fourth forgiveness of you O, "Haomeh" ..." the death repeller ... a mighty strong man, with the earthly desires, to stay on this earth to conquer enemies and lying. The fifth request is ... to be victorious on this land, in order to defeat enemies and bandits ..." (Razi, *ibid*: 115). At the fourth and fifth appeals, emphasis is only on the earth, and victory is on this worldly earth. There is no reference to the great heaven and the triumph of the good over the evil and the sovereignty of religion and the heaven on earth. These thoughts and cultures were in fact against the habitual streamline procedure in the ancient world. In the ancient religious / metaphysical world, the same contrast to the habitual process, and physical / terrestrial being has caused kurds / Mitraeists to be nicknamed as the devil, Zahak, dragon, Jin ... and get hated. There is no demand for the liberation of spirit, paradise, and hell, the ruling of Ahu-ramazda, the world of Samuel on the earth. The earth and the body and the comfort of earth-ly life are worthwhile in themselves, not a means to advance the religion and the high heaven. This earthly / physicality being is both related to applicants and applied people.

Haomeh is referred to as the death holder. Not the repeller of evil, sin, and lust ... Therefore, Zoroastrianism treated Homo as the death repeller harshly and in the ninth Yasna, the Haome is described as the intelligence repeller of the people. In this sense, the intelligence means death and nonsense (Razi, *ibid*: 116). We will later come to Zoroastrian conflict with Mi-tra and Haomeh. Here, it should only be mentioned that the Haoma, which is called the death repeller, is referred in Zarathustraism with humility and hatred and the intelligence repeller of the people. It means the culture (Mitra / Haomeh) which asks for the health of the people and the life in this world, and repelling the death of death is addressed as the intelligent repeller and

people misleader. It means that a person or an idea that calls people towards the welfare and life in this world and not towards the other world and the release of the soul becomes hypocrite and pagan. The secret behind the obnoxious being (Demon, Satan, Jin, Azhidahak) of the Kurds from the Gothic to the Contemporary period are the ones that had been against metaphysical / national cultures of the Middle East being instrumental in preserving the power of the dominant classes. Kurds have defended the life of this world, body and flesh and they, as the true reality, have not undergone the symbolic order of belief in the other world and the illusion of the spirituality. This has been the reason to nickname Medes as the Zohak, the brain-eater. Braineating was a symbol of the misleading mind and brainwashing. After the Islamic Revolution, the Kurds were the only people who did not give up against the symbolic order and the ideology of the Islamic Republic and they were termed as the preventers of the development of the celestial / religious culture and as head-cutter Kurds.

There not only culture or anti-culture is demonstrated, Dionizus / Terrestrial Mitra in Mehryasht but also in some historical inscriptions. However, as Meheyasht has taken the earlier form of Zeroasterism, Mithraism real nucleus does not appear except through the removal of its extra Zeroasterism branches. These inscriptions have the color and dye of Zerosterian / Iranian through which we can discover its real essence. One of these inscriptions is from Antioch us Kumagen in Mount Nimrood that is perhaps the earliest inscription derived from the Mitra (Hensman, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 260), and it is the first evidence of the Mitra in Asia Minor (Turcan, 1996, 196). This inscription dates back to 1400 AD involving a peace treaty between Hittite and Mitani in which the Mitani king appeals to Mithra as thr guardian and the witness.(Thieme, 1960: 301) Kumazhin is in the east of the present Turkey today (Ashtiani, *ibid*: 10) where it has been the shelter of the Kurds from the Mitany / Huri era up to the present time 123.

The Komajin inscription is influenced by the Mithani and Mithraism ritualism (Guillmin, cited in Closka, *ibid*: 227). Georges Dumasil found out a great deal of correlation between the system of the Komegen gods and the gods mentioned in the Mitany treaty. But what does Antiochus promise to the believers?

"In Kumazin we encounter something that is contrary to what is common in the ancient world; the king is just concerned about his immortality, and he does not promise anyone the next world. He only promises good life, good food and good wine (not the hereafter and ...) ... Lacking the promise of the Hereafter and, at the same time, the musician girl instead of Moghan, ... holy prostitution and ... are some characteristics of this civilization. Here, we face the presence of musicians on the one hand, and the lack of mogan and fire temples on the other; hence, we are facing the sacred Hom drink, who have no resemblance to the Iranian religion in which they ate the sacrificed meat ... the musician, instead of the magi, gets sips of the Hom drink that is unrelated to Iran's religion "( Guillmin, *ibid*: 222-229). Gaeman has encountered the culture of Kumajin in which there are the sex and dance of Dionysius, which is contrary to the ancient world, instead of the promises of the hereafter and the heaven and hell, and the soul's survival . He cannot analyse it since it does not come to the Iranian, nor the Greek culture. Gamman confesses that unfortunately we do not know anything about the popular culture of this country. In fact, he chose bad in choosing bad and worse, and he con-siders it a Greek culture covered in Iranian glaze (*ibid*: 231). Nevertheless, as Gayman him-self also raised this question, if it is Greek, why has it been adapted to the Iranian Mithra? The Greeks not only

have never had a god named Mitra, but they consider the lion-headed Mithra with the snake rounding it as Medusa that belongs to the Hades world. Medusa, which the Greeks themselves regard the Medes to be of his generation, are drafted from the Medes and the Mithraian religion with the dragon's body and the snake hair similar to the Ajyda in the Iranian culture.

Therefore, Kumajin is neither the Greeks nor the Iranian, but it is the Median/Kurdish.

Furthermore, in Mithraism, there was no belief in the soul and the world after death, and no signs of the metaphysical god and soul have been discovered either. To prove that Mitra, the Median religion, was not God, but the treaty, it is enough to say that nothing called the body of the gods and the worshipful body or signs of believing in the soul after death has been discovered.

In Mede, there have been found no trace of idolatry or worship of gods in the form of stones and idols; there has never been found any work of God worshipping. "In the description of the Assyrians regarding their campaign, there is never any discussion about the list of Median looted shrines and also there occurs no trace of the transportation of the statue of gods and Median goddesses. "(Boyce, 1375: 39). Therefore, "there is no idol or image in the Medes; there nothing was discovered in Noshi Jan and in the Assyrian calendar about the images of the gods in the Median areas" (Wiesehofer, 2001, in trans. By Saqibfer: 1377/1998: 96). Since There has been found objects in all Median graves from the poor and the rich, ... the Median graves do not tell us anything about belief in the hereafter, such as belief in the paradise for the rich and the dark underground for the poor ... which has been widespread among the Indians and the Persians" (ibid., 43: Herzfeld, 1936, in trans by Hekmat, 1354/1975: 73). Thus, the Medians did not believe the Hereafter about which in the discussion concerning Mitra, we proved that the Medes and the Mithraians did not have any belief in the spirit, spirituality, and metaphysics, which are also evident in Median graves. "Median burials are certainly not Zoroastrians ... there is not news of the gods of India and Iran among the Medes. ... There are no signs of fire-worshipping, too." (Diakonoff, Cambridge, 2008: 168).

#### - Mitra: Garden or Bagh, Paradise or Ferdows

Mithra has not been human transcendental God, nor a worshipable one, and Bagh, the nickname of Mithra that was later interpreted as God has not been God but it meant the garden /paradise and also Mir/Mehr has meant the king, that is the king elected through contract not picked or appointed by gods. Since God himself was the creature and earthly or the same chosen king by the people, the paradise also meant Pardis in this same earth.

Walter Hunts calls the Medians as the infatuaters of the garden, flowers and plants: "If we want to describe Medians in a single word, we call them the enthusiasts of the garden termed as pardis and coming from Greek to Europe. Pardis is a median word that later changed into Arabic Ferdows "(Hinz, 2007: 215). However, the Median paradise was a place of joy, bless and dance in this same world, but it was transmitted to the hereafter in Iranian / Zoroastrian and Islamic / Arabic culture.

Apollos reports that: "Mehrists had shelters in the mountains and the cave along which a spring of flowing would pass that was covered with flowers and plants and based on the viewpoint of the Medes, this kind of cave connoted Median world" (Razi, 1381/2002: 232). Porphyry writes:

"The ceremonies of Mitraies is in the natural caves which there should be wa-ter, river or springs near the cave ... even they would build iconic caves like the natural ones near the water "(ibid: 273). They would cover the entrance to the cave with foliage and plant freshness that were the symbol of greenness (Razi, ibid; 289). Sacrificing the cow is in the beginning of spring, the cow connotes the winter. (Razi, ibid; 381).

Pythagoras, who considered the celebration to be at the end of the winter (the beginning of spring), writes: " a semi-naked farmer like Bakus-Pryab, Bakus, the god of wine and th garden and the goddess of the beaty, was in the field spreading seed (Razi, the same, 236). Bakus, or the same Dionysus has the other name, Zagros. At the time of Homer, Dionysus had no place among the gods of the Olympians, the origin of this God is in Asian rites (Cassirer, 1377/1998: 111-112). Mede was the place where wine was made, and the Avestan word, Mede, meant wine and drink; the Media has been the land of wine. Zagros in Greek meant ripped off and the title of Bakus, the god of agriculture and drunk was derived from the word of the bagh (garden) ... in Zagros (Kahlan, 1375/1996: 365).

The play Dionysus Avery Pides, speaks of the land that Dionysus came from, says: " Dionysus says I went trough the plains of the Pars over the dry land and via the plains of Balkh to the hard and dreadful fields of Madad ..." an old narrative says that Dionysus came from Nisa (Nisa was the place of breeding horses), The name or the title of Dionysus in yuan was always Bakhos or Bagayos which was the same title of Mehr i.e. Bagh (Moghadam, 1380/2001: 8889). Therefore, Dionysus is the same median Mithra.

Another nickname of Dionysus is Mithra Forus, meaning someone who wears the Median hat related to the cow sacrifice. Orpheus, who beats the harp and gather the animals around himself puts on a Median hat (Moghadam, ibid: 89). The celebration of the Mehregan was mixed with the celebrations of the Dionysius, the Bacchus, and the Greek Orephos (Razi, 1381/2002: 202).

At every ceremony of the cow sacrifice, the Mehrists dance and rejoice with eating bread and wine, which is a symbol of meat and blood of the cow (Vermaseren, ibid: 73 – 74; Hinz, 2007: 287; Guillmin, Closka, ibid: 227; Razi, 1381/2002: 279 and 242). According to a Pythagorean travel book, women also participated in the ceremony (Razi, ibid; 236).

In the past, Bagh or Baga has denoted Mitra (Herzfeld, 39; Boys, 1375, 41). Baghbadish month, month / feast (Eid) has been called Bagh or Mitra (Boys, the same, 209). Mitra has been described in the inscriptions as бага. The form of his name is Median, it can be called Baga or Bagh. But, Mitra is Bag is ... the words bagabigna and bagabuxsa and ... bag or baaga precisely means Mitra, and the name Baghyadis-sh also refers to the Mitra's moon "(Widingren, 1377/1998: 70-74). Medes gave the name of Bhaghistana or the place of Gods to Mount Bisotun (Boyce, ibid; 39).

In the material stated above, a few points should be taken into consideration. Medians have been so fond of the garden, flowers, plants and joy that - as Hinz told - if we describe them with a word, it is the same as pardis. At the Mithratian ceremony, idancing, joy and drunkenness has always been accompanied by eating wine. Dionysus, the god of drunkenness, dancing and wine, was originally from Zagros and he has been the same Mithra coming to Greece. The cow sacrifice cermonny were held in spring, along with water springs and around the cave covered with flowers, grass and plants. Bag or Bagh ha only been special for the god of Mitra not other gods. The name of Bisotun is derived from Baghistan or Baga, the god of Mithra. All these



things link together through a concept but there is an anomaly here. Pardis and Bagh or Mitra are defined with happiness, dance and worldly life, but why did Bistoun (baghistoun) become famous as place to worship the gods and how did the earthly paradise of Mede become heavenly fernandos?

The basic point is that Baghistan (Bistoun) among the Medes has been the place of Mithra god / Bagh, - with the descriptions of the Mitra and their ceremonies –it has meant the place of joy, flowers and plants along with dance and pleasure in the same sense as the pardis, Bagg / Mitra. In the same way that its Median meaning (contract and earthly) was converted to the sun and heaven, Bhagan did not mean the god among the Medes. Some new historians have casted doubts about whether it is possible to put the name of God on Mithra (Hinnells, 1990: 11). According to Theme, the Mitra / Bagh becoming the god was the later construction of Iranians / Indians. Though Deyoung poses this question that we do not know where and when, the Mithra of the covenant became a worshipable divinity among the Persians and Ro-mans (Jong, 1997; 287). However, David Alnassi has correctly pointed out that the Mithra killing the bull has turned into a worshipable god in the first century BC (Ulansy, 1991: 94). According to Mary Boyce, there is still no compelling reason to suggest that a supreme god or Mithra as God has existed among the Iranians (Mede, Qaderi) before Zoroastrianism (Boyce, 2001: 243). in the Medes' culture,

Apart from its main meaning i.e. the contract, on the one hand, Mitra / Bagh meant the garden, happiness and worldly life; on the other hand, it meant the king that transformed into the goddess in Iranian culture, and Bishtun, were changed to the status or the resident of the goddess. With the sovereignty of the Iranians, it turned into the place of the Mogan goddess worshipping. It means that the concept of Baghestān in the Median was a completely earthly concept meaning a place of joy and pleasure, i.e. garden / paradise. Henning also has defined Mitra or bagha meaning gardens and places of flowers. "Henning considered the word bagayadi as related to the word bagh (garden) due to a high "a" sound in both parts of this name and because of this long vowel the second part, it is unlikely to involve the root of yaz and, in general, calls this month as the month of gardening. " However, maintaining its original name in Iran, they changed its content and turned into the place of gods and worship and prayer of Bagh / goddess. In the Media, there has been nothing under the name of the temple and the worshipping site because Mithra has not been God at all to be worshipable. Although the hill of Noshijon in the Media has scattered the seeds of skepticism in the minds of the scholars about the Medes beliefs as it has been in the form of a temple. This temple was destroyed in the seventh century AD and its ruins became stables (Yamauchi, 1390/2011: 37). Some believe that it has had a religious function. The other viewpoint considers the hill of NoshiJohn as a prayer place or Deowadaneh destroyed by Khashayar Shah during the battle against the local rituals non-aligned with Ahura Mazda (Grishmen, 1976: 176). Although this theory maybe be true, it does not state the whole reality as it has been abandoned around the age of 700 BC. "It is likely that the real founder of Median State, Hakhshere, breaking down the sovereign authority of the local rulers before 615 BC destroyed it. "(Stronach, Cambridge, 1387: 1043). Mary Boyce has a similar idea that " because the notable hill of Noshijon was under the domination of the eastern Medes, perhaps, it has been the reconstruction of foreigners brides marrying there and without having any defect, have been filled and laid on with clay and stone and the entrance of the rooms has been closed with the clay and stones and its street has been blocked "(Boyce, 1375/1996: 54-55). Therefore, the hill of NoshiJon, which looked like a temple, was probably

from the new Aryans entering the Mediate Union in Eastern Media, which, with empowering western Medes and the formation of a Median state, has been deliberately destroyed by Hakhshtrah because the Median culture did not have any religious belief in temples and sacred places. "Archaeological evidence tells us that the existence of the Median religious places have been rejected at the end of the seventh century, not because of military occupation and destruction, but peacefully have been left (Liverani, 2003: 7).

Returning to the original argument, in the same way that an inverse meaning was molded on the concept of Mithra / garden in Iran, the paradise which were used to call earthly beautiful places in Mede, was abstracted into pure Ferdows and hereafter Paradise in the hereafter in Islam. Baghistan also abstracted from the place of love and worldly happiness to the place of gods and worship. If, even in Medi, it had the same meaning as the position of the gods, it meant not a place of worship, ... but it denoted such a pleasant paradise that they would enjoy it like the gods having no pain and concern. The paradise of the gods should be made on earth, or (as Hegel on the other occasion has said: "God is ourselves. Today, we also call many of the places we enjoy as paradise, which does not mean the hereafter heaven and pray-er or worshipping. God in the Medes who lacked the metaphysical culture did not have a heavenly meaning and as the creator. God was earthly and did not have a meaning beyond a king, and since he himself was not a metaphysician and celestial creator, he was the god-king/connected with the earth and the creature of the people / Khalkh. In the Media, Khalk were the Shah's creators or the same Mithra /Treaty, which in Iran and Islam was interpreted based on their metaphysical culture through confiscation of words and in opposition to Mitra. They took God / the garden to heaven and they took being the creator from the people and gave it to God. God / the king that was the creature of the people and chosen by contract in Mede would become the god who is the king's creator.

It can also be generalized to the word Izadi (godly) that today there is a group of original Mithraians in the same name of Izadi (godly) in Shingal. Izad/ God in Med was in the sense of Shah / Mir taken from the Mehr / Pir, the last stage of the Mithrahi Seven phases. Pir means social contract and Mitra. Mir is the same as Mehr, that is, someone who would become Mir or Izad (god) chosen by the covenant / Mehr like Diaako, according to Herodotus definition; therefore, in Izadi poetries, he is called the Sultan of Izad (God). But in Iran, the goddess, like the bagh, was deprived of its earthly/ covenant meaning, and, like the paradise, went to heaven, and Mir/Izad, the creature of the covenant of people, became the creator of the people. When God went from the earth to heaven, it is natural that the earthly paradise also moves to heavenly paradise. Iran and history, on the one hand, in regret and complexity of the earthly paradise of the Medes, planned the design of the moral constraints, guilt and condemnation of earthly pleasure, and on the other hand, they confiscated paradise, pleasure and happiness of Mithra and took it to the heaven.

This is the strategy of the Iranian intellect in which they, by preserving the names and words, give them the Iranian / Zoroastrian meaning. Iran's political shrug off things through preserving their appearance, and it disarms them via confiscating the culture of the subjugated nations. Iranian intellect did not destroy Mitra, but it transformed its content completely in which the anti-sun and anti-cow Mithra turned into a sun and bull-friendly Mithra. Bagh, meaning garden / paradise and a place of happiness, it turned into the meaning of the status of gods and the place of worship in Iran. The term "Pardis, which meant earthly "paradise" and "place of joy

and dance in Mede" turned into Hereafter Ferdows. Farhoushi (top pleasance), which meant joy and joy which among the Kurds, was interpreted into the spirit of the dead in Iran. In the same way as the anti-Iranian Kurds who the foundation of Iranland was developed based on their negation and neglect and making them the others turned into Iranian Kurds and original Iranians. We will return to these issues later; however, this has not been understood by many of the Orientalists as well. Iranians do not destroy but confiscate through preserving its appearance and changing its content, they have made it as Iranian / Zoroastrian. In the same way, they even transformed Islam into Iranian form. They do not deny the existence of the Kurds but with the opposition of the other –making of the Kurds, they give a positive image of Iranian Kurds and they redefine an Iranian history and culture for the Kurds who are originally anti-Iranian, which even the Kurds themselves believe in them. They make The Orientalists who define Kurdish culture as Iranian commit the same mistake. For example, they find the word "Farhoushi" both in Zarathustra and Iran in Media, then, regardless of the meaning differences in each of these two cultures, and more importantly, regardless of which one earlier, and which ones were taken from, they rule on the nominal similarity and, as a result, the cultural/religious similarities of Kurdish and Iranian. In fact, most of Iranian culture is a confiscation of Median culture, which, of course, Iranians have changed its color and glaze, and they have made it Iranian / Zoroastrian. Herodotus indirectly referred to the characteristics of the Iranian cultural confiscation: "There is no nation as Iranian people adopting the foreign habits so quickly and easily ... they adopted the Median's style of clothing as they recognized them better than theirs ... "(Herodotus, 1387: 106). This statement of Herodotus is related to the appearance of the issue, and as we will indicate later in history and historiography of Kurds that Herodotus' information about Iranians was based not on research, but on the basis of words heard and narrated by the Iranians themselves. Therefore, it lacks the elegance and virtue in a way so that to appreciate Iranian cultural skills. This adaptation is not limited to the apparent cases such as dress, but it also involves this significant point that the Persians, who were warrior intruders from the southern Russian steppes, lacking any progressive culture have seized many of the Median cultural manifestations and recorded them as a part of their own culture.

#### Mitra / Mehr: Autumn or Spring, Nowroz or Mehrgan?

From among other Zoroastrian distortions in order to conceal and eventually to destruct Median culture and conquer the mind of the Medes is changing Mehr from spring to autumn and also changing the Medes' spring feast famous as Mehrgan into Iranian Norouz. Mitra / Mehr, the first month of the Median calendar was at the beginning of the spring. Bull-slaying ceremony of the Median Mithraean in the spring and the lion accompanying Mithra in every event are the symbol of the spring, which, they inversed its meaning into fall for the religious and political reasons. The Mehregan was the feast celebrating the victory of Zahhak in the spring with symbols such as snake and Mitra, which the Persian / Iranian ideological machine transferred it into Zahak's failing celebration in fall.

We have already pointed out that the entrance of the cave, where the cow-killing ceremony was carried out, was covered with the foliage and refreshing plants (Razi, 1381/2002: 289). This flower and vegetation are the indication of the spring. Bull-slaying by Mitra and Mithraians have always been in the beginning of the spring (Razi, *ibid*: 387). Pythagoras also described the celebration of Mitra at the end of the winter (the beginning of the spring) (Pythagoras, cited

in Razi, *ibid*: 236). European Mithraists also celebrated the feast of Mi-tra and bull-slaying in spring (*ibid*: 215). Therefore, Mehr kills the cow in the spring (Razi, *ibid*: 478).

When Cotus has the head of the cow in his arms, the sun is in Taurus corresponding to the time of the spring. Helyos, Kotopates, is the sign of the arrival of the sun and fall (Warmaseren, *ibid*: 105). Kotos has the burning torch in his hands which is the sign of the Mitra-rise and setting of the sun when it is the time of sacrificing the cow. Kotopates with an inverted torch in the sun side is the signal of the sunset of Mithra and the rising of the sun. "The sun / shamash was the sign of the fall and the fall season. Iranians and Hindus have celebrated the fall as the beginning of the year" (Boyce, 1375/1996: 15; Bahar, *ibid*: 496). Babylonians considered the months of Sharivar –Mehr (September-October) that was their autumn feast at the meantime celebrating in the autumn as under the protection of the Shamash / the sun (Boyce, *ibid*: 52). Iranians took their calendar from Babylon or Elam, and their moon was the same as Babylon's year and month, the beginning of their year was like the Jews, not the spring, but the autumn ... In Babylon, the most important source of their year was the feast of Sunshine" (Razi, *ibid*: 209). The same day of the Mehregan or Baghyad is the day of the advent of the sun in Iranian narrations (Razi, *ibid*: 211). The Legend of victory of Fereydoun over Zahhak in Mehr (October) commemorates the victory of Marduk on Tyamh through which the Babylonian god became epic in Iran, Hamas (Bahar, *ibid*: 499). Thus, Iranians celebrated New Year in autumn, and the sun is the symbol of autumn, not spring.

Cow alludes to the winter (Razi, *ibid*: 381). In the heroic myth of Goosh-Orvon, cow refers to the winter, while the role of the lion is the allegory of the summer, the dominance of the lion over the cow is the dominance of the summer on the winter (Razi, *ibid*: 216). Debran star or Aldebaran which is the largest and brightest star in zodiac constellation and considered as "the eye of the cow" in the astrological beliefs has been seen from mid-October to mid-March in the night sky. From mid-October to the beginning of the winter means the time when the coldness and the darkness of the night is increasing and the brightness of the day is decreasing in which the cow is the champion of the sky in the absence of the lion and it is rising up more and more every night as if there is no link between coldness and darkness and the rising of the cow. The lion rises at the beginning of the month after six months of absence, and right from this time on, the days will lengthen. It is like that the lion has come to the aid of the sun for to dispel the coldness and the darkness.

In other words, from four seasons of the year, summer has been without the lion and the cow, autumn has been with the cow, winter with the cow and the lion, and spring with the lion. The celestial bull is the prominent herald of cold and darkness and the celestial lion is the promising messenger of the heat and light. Throughout the winter, the cow first raises every night, and after about four hours, the lion raises after it. The higher the lion comes up, the lower the cow goes down. In the middle of April (Farwardin), when it is getting warm and the days are getting long enough, the cow reaches into the daily sky and it is no longer visible. From the beginning of the winter. It is as though the lion has attacked the cow out of the darkness and coldness field. From mid-April to the beginning of the summer, the lion is the only champion of sky in the long and warm days of the year (Ghiasabadi, 1387/2008: internet). The ancient Elamites displayed the cold season with the cow and the heat season with the lion. Therefore, the illustrated images represent the change of the season, [coming ...] of the spring and the celebration of Nowruz (Hinz, 2007: 67). The cow killed in the hands of the lion in Persepolis

is corresponding to the killing of the cow by Mehr in the religion of Mehrism. It is the task which sovereigns fall upon the devil in the Zoroastrian (Bahar, 2005: 170). Grishman, with these two assumptions and illustrating the cow as a symbol of the cold season and the lion as the sign of the warm season, concludes that the bold inscription of lion triumphing over the cow, (see pictures) is to show the end of the coldness and the start of the heat. (Nobakht, 1387/2008: Internet). Thus, in a general conclusion, it can be said that the role of lion and cow in Persepolis, which was the place for the celebration of Nowroz during the Achaemenid period, is a combination of constellation associated with the coming of spring and the beginning of the New Year (lion- cattle -lamb). (Useful). Totem of cow and the symbol of the Persians and the Milk of the Totem of the Medes. Many of the princes of Persepolis are decorated with the role of the cow. The philosophy of Zoroastrianism and its religion is to support the cow's psyche in the face of the Mitrahians.<sup>87</sup> However, the remaining Medieval remains of the ancient remains are the role of Ekbatan stone. The bull-killer lion is a symbol of bull-slaying Mithra and recreation of his action, because in all the works of Mithra, the lion is the holy animal and the sweetheart of his cave. "Nowruz is also not in the Avesta because the Avesta is a religion and has its own feasts, and the Eid is not related to the Zoroastrians. Nowruz was also before the Achaemenids." (Bahar, 1384/2005: 347) Therefore, Nowruz is not Iranian / Zoroastrian but the material / The mithrae that has been abolished by the Iranians and its meaning has changed, maybe the Kurdish Spring Festival was called Mehregan, but why is Mitra and her puppy lion, which is a symbol of the advent of the spring, has been transmitted to autumn?

There are several reasons why the Mithra transferred from spring to autumn. First, we will consider its religious reasons and then its political reason which is the main reason. As we said earlier, the celebration of the beginning of the Iranian year was autumn. Of course, this autumn celebration was not the celebration of Mehregan or Mitra; at that time, neither the Mithra was an autumn celebration, nor the Iranians were Mithraists.

"The natural correspondance of Ahura-Mesara in Mesopotamia was Shamash that was the God of justice and virtue and the source of human laws. The Elamite God of the sun was not unrelated to justice in contrast to Iranian Mithra (Median, qaderi). At first, he was the God of the contract and consequently the God of law enforcement for observing the treaties ... Iranians had their own Shamash or sungod and they called him Horkheshita or the sun ... Later, Moghan set up Mithra under that title in order to confront the goddess of Shamash (Boyce, 1996: 46). The combination of Mitra with Babylonian Shamash molded Mithra in the form of the sun's character (Gnoli 132 in Jong, 1997: 286). Shamash, the God of the Babylonian justice is in the fall. Iranian Moges brought Mithra meaning contract to the fall to confront the Babylonian Shamash and they framed Shamash, the sun, on it.

The Babylonians regarded Shahrivar- Mehr (September- October) that was their feasts at the same time under the support of Shamash, the Mitra's Mesopotamian counterpart. After introducing their spring festivity as the New Year's celebrations, Mogies saw it fit to attribute their traditional autumn celebration to Mitra and it was from that time onwards that they regarded the autumn celebration as related to the God of the sun ... it strengthened the connection between the Mitra and the sun, and caused Mithra to find popular acceptance and a religious symbol "(Boyce, *ibid*: 52). There are some points in this passage from Mary Boyce; first, the Babylon highlighted Shamash in opposition to Mitra. Second, the traditional feast of

Iran was not under the name of Mehregan, but later, they transmitted the Mehregan from spring to autumn in confront to Babylonian Shamash and they molded the name of Mehregan on their old autumn festival, and since their autumn celebration was a celebration of the sun, Mitra changed from contract to the sun. "After being united with the sun, Mitra was respected as a holy god among the Persians" (Jong, *ibid*). Meanwhile, the Median precursor Mithra was removed and rejected as the Devil.

Therefore, the fall festivity of the Iranians has nothing to do with the covenant and Median Mithra, and Mithra is transformed and combined with the sun. Because "the Persian celebration in autumn coincided with the autumn feast of Babylonian that was the feast of the sun of God. Iranians renamed their autumn celebration and called it Mitra-Kana or Mehregan through changing Mithra into the sun" (Boyce, *ibid*). This combination of Mitra with the sun, has made Mitra more acceptable in Iran. By parrelling Mithra with the goddess of the sun, he was worshiped more in Iran because the sun-worshipping has been strong in the an-cient Middle East (Boyce: 46). It seems that illustrating Mitra accompanied by fire, light and the sun was carried out during the Achaemenid period. (Jong, 1997: 286).

Since Iranians could not forget the Newsard or Newroz which they adopted it from Mesopotamian with the coming of Zarathustra, they considered it the same one with the help of Moghan and the fall festivity changed into the spring feast. Nonetheless, since the Zoroastrians did not have a feast equivalent with Mehregan, it never became an indispensable Zoroastrian religion feast despite its popularity in the west of Iran (Boyce, *ibid*: 160). Boys indicated that first it did not become a Zoroastrian feast despite being popular among the people of Zarathustra. And most importantly, Nowroz is not an Iranian celebration, and Iranians celebration has never been in spring.. As Boyce insists Babylon has regarded Shamash in contrast to Mitra. The origin of the spring feast has been Mehregan/Median Mehrabe and it is likely that they have set up Babylonian Newsard in contrast to it. Because Boys himself has confirmed that the feast of the Iranians, Jews and Babylonians was in the autumn, not the spring, and the material that we said about the cow-killing of Mithra in the spring, leads us to this conclusion that the spring celebration has been a Median/Mithraist feast under the name of the Mehregan. The celebrations of other religions have been in correspondence with the spring feast of the Medes as the sanctifying of the cow from Egypt, Assyria and Babylon to Iran and India has been in opposition to the cow-killing of the Median Mithra. Probably Indians and Europeans have celebrated New Years like Babylonians and Egyptians. ... According to the Veda, New Year celebrations were related to the reopening of the activities of the fire-the sun-during the winter revolution ... a beginning after the twelve days period of the leap year ... "(Guillmin ,1378: 47). Thus, the Iranian new year's celebration like the Babylonians' and Egyptians', and ... has been in winter and a solar one. However, they confiscated the spring feast from the Medes and reversed its title and meaning.

After confiscating Yashts and Mitra, Zoroastrian Iranians tried to make them as the Iranian / Zoroastrian and assimilated their real nature. The feast of the Medes, unlike Mesopotamians and Iranians, was in the spring festival in the spring and Mitra was a spring festivity and Mehr was the first month of the Medians. Along with the ruling of Iranians and confiscating Median culture and religion, and transferring the fall celebration to the spring, the first day and the first month of the spring festival were renamed and changed with the feast itself. Instead of the names of the Median ritual, the Zoroastrian sacred named would come in the first place.

Hormozd, the same Day, was already in winter in line with the Iranian feast, was transferred to the first of spring. The first day of the month of Day, the month of God, be-comes the birthday of the sun (Razi, 1381/2002:386). Then the seven Amshaspand, Khordad, Mordad and ... which were in order as Hormozday, seven. Amonhaspand, Khordad, Mordad, Ordibehesht, Shahrivar, and then Mehr transferred to the seventh month after Ahuramazda and Amasaspandan in which the seventh month from the first of spring moved to the first of fall, which is now the month of Mehr. 88

Therefore, the Iranians, not only transformed the Mithra / Mehr from the contract into the sun, from lion and snake to cow, but also from spring to autumn. With the confiscation of the Median spring festivity, they changed its content and made Mitra as the God of the sun and fall consistent with Babylon Shamash. Few writers or no writers at all have noticed this change in the seasons, 89 although it is very clear. The lion, the symbol of Mithra, kills cow. In all ancient calendars, the lion is the symbol of spring and cow is the symbol of the winter. How is it possible that the lion that is the sign of the spring have moved to the fall in the order of the months? How Mithra himself that kills winter cow is the indication of the winter. Basically, Mithra has been a spring festival and all ceremonies of cow sacrifices have been held in spring. The feast of the Iranians, which regarded the cow as holy has been in the fall. Change and conversion of these seasons and months, as usual, has been the result of wickedness of Zoroastrian Iranians tricks.

However, the main reason behind this change of seasons and months is political and as the result of Iranian controversy with the Medes. The onset of most of the Median/Kurdish movements has been in the spring. The Medes formed their government in the spring, they took over Asshur in the spring, the uprising of Guamata occurred in the spring, and Demon (Ahriman) invaded the creators of Ahura in the spring. But the defeat of the Medes / Zakhak from Persians / Fereydun was in the fall. Darius also defeated Geomata in the fall. The Iranians made the celebration of the Median triumph as the day of their defeat, that is, the Medes whose celebration was the beginning of their new year in the spring when they were sacrificing cow, dancing and rejoicing, most of their uprisings and their victories were in the same time and in line with the passion of the new year celebrations. After defeating the Medes which happened in the fall, the Iranians seized their memories and celebrations and they celebrated the day of the Median victory as the day of their defeat through preserving their celebrations but changing their content and time so that the day of the Median victory was celebrated as the day of their defeat. "Norouz and Mehregan celebrations are not Indian and Iranian celebrations, and there does not exist in Avesta, a celebration of these two festivals and nor in Rigveda. These two native celebrations are prior to the arrival of the Aryans to the Iranian plateau" (Bahar, *ibid*: 494-495). Iranians who lacked such festive events grappled them from the Medes, but they displaced both the content and the history of it to coordinate the memory of the celebration with the memory of their own victory. Highlighting the memory of the defeat of the Medes, they tried to cleanse the effects of their victory via bolding their failure from the Persians. That is why the Mehregan in the spring, when it was Nowruz too transformed to the fall when the Medes were defeated. Nowruz, which was the day of the victory of Zakhak (Medea) and Gaumata, became the day of their defeat.

The 16th of Mehr (October) was the day of the murder of Guamata when at that day Fereydun revolted which is a vague reminder of the departure of Darius on the Gomata ... The tenth day

of the month of Baghyadesh – Babylon Teshar – corresponding with Mehr (October) 21, was a great feast commemorating the victory of Frieden on Zahhak (Razi, *ibid*: 211). victories of Mitra on the cow, Zahak on Jamshid, Gomata on Cambyes and ... all were in the spring, and all of them were defeated in the fall. The Mehregan celebration in the spring, which saved the great memory of the victories of the Med along with happiness, cheering and dancing, would not easily disappear from memories and it unconsciously conveyed the memory of the greatness of the Medes and their historical triumphs. The Iranians, who were unable to destroy the memories of these celebrations, changed the content and time on it via preserving its appearance and they adapted the memory of these victories and joys on their own victories through taking it to the time of the fall and turning the day of the victory of the Medes as the day of their defeat 92. Mithra had a great influence among the people as the Zoroastrian Persians were aristocratic ruling class but the people were still Median / Mithraists. later (Rostam ...), we will come back to Darius and Moghan's cleverness in conquering and occupying the minds of the Medes. However, I will only signify that Darius knew the experience of confronting the Medes with the Assyrian in which even if the Medes are defeated thousands of times, they would rebel again, and he knew well the secret behind the revival of the Medes lies in the culture of Mithra and the energy arising from it. He knew it is the power of the celebrations of the Medes to bring about the energy of resistance. For this reason, after the military crackdown, he thought of the occupation of their minds through changing Mehregan from spring to fall to remove joyfull memories of the medes' victories and replacing it with the memory of Persian victories. Thus, the semantic constructs of the feast must have been changed, too. The aristocratic Kave as the Persian supporter and as the enemy of Medes turned to the sacred Kave pleasant for the Kurds'spring festivals and Zahakian Kurds became Zakhak destroyers. The Mehregan of con-tract became the Mehregan of the Sun and in these ways .... Dariush and Moghan occupied the Kurdish wisdom and they transferred from "punishment" to "caring" and instead of up-pressing the Kurds they undertook producing Iranian kurds. Through hollowing and depleting Mithraism celebrations and their meanings, the Kurd's mind was brought under the conquest of the Persian intellect. Since then, the rebellious irrational insurgents changed into the power-ful female camel but blind and practical; thus, the Kurdish uprisings lacked their own proper theory. They were practically confronting with Iran, but they were theoretically the captives of the Iranians. Eventually, the process of Iranianization of Media and Zoroastrianization of Mitra was completed with Ardeshir, who is in the legend of Bahman, is completed; for this reason, when Ardeshir was crowning, the Mithra of the sun was also present.

#### Iranian Religion and Ritual: Zoroastrianism

The Zoroastrian religion was founded around 600 BC by the Zarathustra who was a real historical character. Zarathushtra formed the image of the evil world in his mind by observing the Mithraicism of the Medes and he constructed up its religious system and the image of the universe of Goodness and Ahura Mazda in contrast to it. The principle and the foundation of Zoroastrian religion was formed to confront and oppose the Mitra's religion. Zoroaster's evil was the same Mithra (Jackson, 1985: 17), Zoroaster's Demon was the same Deows or the Median gods and vindidad came to existence against the Medes. After recognizing that he was not able to destroy Mitra at all, Zarathushtra accepted many of Mitra's concepts but changed



their content. He depleted Ferawashi from its earthly meaning and gave a metaphysical sense to it. He put Homane in the place of Mitra. Zoroaster emerged in confrontation to Mitra / Mad, while he called the Medes as Ajidahak and Mitra as Demon and also he confiscated the culture and language of Med / Mitra. Zoroaster was united with the Persians as ant-Kurd/Mithra; however, it does not mean that we consider as Zoroastrians' / Persians' whatsoever that is badged as Zoroastrianism. For example, the language and concepts of Zoroaster are Median, he has only hollowed its meaning load and has given it the Persian / Zoroastrian sense. Besides, a large part of Avesta, such as the Yiddish, is Mithraism / Median, which later were given Zoroastrianism color and glaze.

### The Time of Zarathuster

Many historians have accepted the traditional time of the advent of Zarathustra, but some other historians have not considered it as acceptable and have considered an earlier time for the advent of Zarathustra. Marry Bois knew the time of the advent of Zarathustra in the period when the Aryans have not entered the Iranian soil yet and were living in the steppes of southern Russia, whose approximate time was 1200 to 1500 BC. (Boyce, 2001: 20; Boyce, 2007: 19-87). Bois described the Gots as belonging to the bronze period, when the society was divided into three groups of herdsmen, clerics and warriors (Boyce, 1982: 1). Newlli also considers the approximate time of the advent of Zarathustra about 900 BC (Newly, 1381: 212). The theory that Zarathustra's time dates back to much older periods has become popular among Iranians in recent decades (Nigosian, 1993: 15). In contrast, the vast majority of ancient Iranian historians and Zoroastrian scholars have accepted the traditional theory of Zoroastrian time, and his approximate history dates back to 600 BC, a few years before the birth of the Achaemenid Empire. Zoroaster was contemporary to Cyrus or shortly before him (Brown, 2012: 23-24). Walter Hinz considered the exact date of the birth of Zoroastrianism as in 630 AD, and he speaks of the possibility of a meeting between him and Cyrus (Hinz, 2007: 70). Henning, like Guillemin and Jackson recognized the traditional history of Zarathustra's time in 600 BC as correct (Henning, 1364/1985: 28). Herzfeld also accepts the traditional time of Zoroaster and regarded him as the grandson of Ajdahak's daughter that Ajdahak was the last king of the Mede (Herzfeld, cited in Henning, *ibid*: 18). Herzfeld, also knows Zarathustra as the avant-garde of the struggle against Gumatia. Therefore, today, the doubts existed about the traditional history of the time of the advent of Zarathustra have been gone away and most people consider the time of the advent of Zoroastrianism as that which is based on the Zoroastrian historiography, that is, 258 years before Alexander's invasion, 588 BC. Henning considered the year 588 as the year of rising Zarathustra at the age of 30 or 42, when goodness religion became as that of Vriestp (Henning, *ibid*: 94). However, considering the presence of Zarathustra in the wars of Darius against Gumatia - which we will later consider it - the year 588 seems to be the birthday of Zoroaster, and 558, at the age of 30, was the culmination of the Zoroaster's propaganda and his acquaintance with Cyrus or with the Cyrus agent, Vishtasp. He passed away in 522 in the war against Gwumata - who sought to revive the Mithraism religion and destroy the Zoroastrians. Therefore, as El Ethem-Steele correctly pointed out the birth year of Zoroaster was in 598 BC. AD, and his death was in 521 (Wiesehöfer, 1389/2010: 111).

Zoroastrian tradition regards Zoroaster's birthday as 583-660 CE. "Zad Seprem" considers the time from the advent of religion up to Alexander's attack - the demise of religion - as 300 years.

Bendehesh know the advent of Zarathustra until the death of Alexander as 272 years, Massoudi and Abu Rayhan also saw Zarathustra birthyear as 258 years before Alexander's assault on Iran.

- The philosophy of the advent of Zoroaster and the demonization of Mitra

Zarathustra conceived himself as the prophet of God, messenger of ethic heavenly values and his purpose as that of realizing the kingdom of God – Kheshtera- on the earth (Hinz, 1386: 36). Zarathustra defined some moral / heavenly values for mankind for the first time on a regular basis and beyond the earth and social values and called for the fulfillment and observance of these heavenly / religious principles on earth, to the point where Nietzsche was the forerunner of God's death and metaphysical and moral values, sharply attacked Zoroaster and his ethical values in the book, "Zarathustra said so". Zoroaster has had a great influence on other religions. Many of the other monotheistic religions borrowed the concepts of paradise and hell, Satan (Ahriman), and the Hereafter, and ... from Zoroaster's religion (Bahar, Ismail Pour, 2005). Even the Jewish religion took the spiritual dimension and the belief in hereafter after familiarizing itself with the Zoroastrianism 95. There is no doubt that the doctrine after the exile of the Jews varied a lot with the doctrine before the exile of this people, which in the later parts of the Old Testament "a creature called Satan ises up" (Moulton, 1387/2008: 114). What does Satan signify and where did it come from? Satan /Devil is constructed by Zarathustra; then, to answer this question, one must understand the philosophy behind the philosophy of Zoroaster's emergence and "the other" of him.

Thus, what was the philosophy of the emergence and the rise of Zoroastrian religion? Hegel says this about philosophy, "the owl of Manirava flies at the sunset," that is, whenever there happens a crisis, philosophy will emerge to resolve the crisis. This is true of religion as well. Unless there did not exist the crisis of idolatry and immorality, the Islamic religion did not appear to reform it. If the insularity crisis in Jewish religion and the relationship of anger to God did not come across, Jesus did not appear with his peaceful and universal message. Therefore, there have had been a crisis that Zarathushtra showed up in order to put it upright.

The scholars assert that Mehr was a great goddess before Zoroaster and Zarathushtra denied the existence of Mehr. K Bar believes that Zoroastrianism gathered Varuna and Mitra in Ahura Mazda so that there remained no room for Mitra. Nyberg argued that Mehr was the Lord of the night that Zoroaster denied him. Zaehner and Gerzowich also say that Zarathustra left aside all the gods except Ahuramazda and Sependino. Humbach and Hunts believe that the Zarathustra absolutely turned against Mithra and opposed worshipping him. According to Lomel Zoroaster deliberately overlooked Mithra and Zarathushtra turned away from the Mitra, a god belonging to the common people of the ignorance time. Based on Mouleh the religion of Ghahan was religious circle of the superiors ignoring popular beliefs. Gershioch accepted the view that Zarathustra considered Mehr as hatred, and Zoroastrians expelled Mehr out from his own religion (Boyce, 2005: 109-110). Dashngiman also believes that Mitra was a long time rival of Mazda, and Zoroaster's silence about him was deliberate, hostile and emotional (Guillmin 1999: 17). The conflict of the Zoroastrianism with Mithraism has been accepted by Ravind Gren, Vikndrand Lumel and Neiberg, too (Razi, 1381/2002: 74).

In order to prove that the basis of the Zoroastrian religion developed in contrast to and for the denial of the Mehr rituals was created. We must find the philosophy of the emergence of the

Zoroastrian religion and the Zarathustra from the Zoroastrian own words and their holy books so as to find out how much Zoroaster's existential philosophy was in contradiction to the ritual of Mitra and their ceremonies like cow sacrifice, drinking Heoma, and Dionysius dancing. Before that, we need to clarify a delicate but very important point that many researchers have not noticed. In this sense, the Mithra which Zarathustra rose in opposition to was the earlier Median Mithra, not the Indian / Rigvedic / Vedic Mithra. Moule and, after him, Mary Boyce and Henning correctly questioned the revolutionary theory of Zoroastrianism against the Hindu-Iranian religion. Moule correctly states that the Gots have a special connection with the Vedas, and Zoroaster did not make any reforms in the old religion, and if some transformations were made, they were spontaneous, not the act of Zoroaster (Moule, cited in Boyce, 1984/2005:103). There are some similarities between the Avesta and the Veda (Boyce, 1982/2003: 14). Henning also argues that "Zarathustra himself pioneered the eclectic and combined Zoroastrian rite that scholars regard it as belonging to the coming developments ... his followers continued it" (Henning, 1964/1985: 50). Therefore, the revolutionary aspect of Zoroaster is not in relation to the ancient Aryan and Indian religion, but to the Medes and an earlier Median Mithra, while the late Iranian Mithra that has put on the Zoroastrian form is no different from the Mithra in Rigveda. The same confiscation, and in the meantime, the change in content also occurred in India. As Theme has said, India is as equally as Iran responsible for the transformation of the abstract concept of the contract / treaty into the imaginary personality of the treaty, which has turned into a true and alive god (cited in Khanda; Alikhani, *ibid*: 76). Now, we will look at the philosophy of the advent of Zarathustra:

Hot 29 is about the complaint of Geosh spirit complaint to the "cow's spirit". The rage of the cow: "to guard me a super warrior is needed ... to eradicate oppression and cruelty (Razi, *ibid*: 158). "According to Hots the complaint of the cow's spirit about becoming the victim is the cause of rising Zoroaster. Ashe (universal discipline) evades cow's questions and grumbles and refers the complaint to God the superior and God selects Zoroaster to protect it (Hinlz, 1985/2006: 142; Razi, 1981/2002:244). The result of cow's complaint is the appointment of Zoroaster and pioneering the human law (Guillmin, 1978/1999: 54). Lomel also in describing Yasna 29 considers the complaint and murmur of the cow as related to the followers of Mithra (Lomel, cited in Bianaki, 2008: 60- 61). In Hots, the philosophy behind the emergence of Zoroaster has been described as in defense of cow spirit against Mithraists with the title of super warrior that must eliminate Mithraists through war and violence.

The spirit of the cow to God ... requests power to the elbows of the farmer and the pastor ... God wonders whom to send to overthrow the cruelty ... so the truth – Ordibehesht - should be essential to incite someone and to set up Ashe, Calm ... Hormazda looks how the irregularity shadows over the world ... Call of Wahumene: The first one who was incited by God is Zarathushtra ... Zoroastrianism: O, Ahuramazda give me power so that I can establish peace and remove oppression and lying. And ... Zarathushtra, in the last stanza sang "So, the people, accept my mission, so that I can spread the religion." (Psalm 29, cited in Razi, 1985/2006: 108). Zoroaster, who the killing of cows stimulated his feelings and his heart, in Yasna 28, explicitly proclaims that he has risen to support and to satisfy the cow's spirit (Razi, 1981/2002: 242).

In book 7 of Dinkard, Mazda created 'Frewashi' or "Zoroaster" at the end of the second three millennia era when Minok turned into a paradise free from sin (Razi 1981: 242). However, this Frewashi remained among Emshaspandan during this three millennia era. At the onset of the

second three millennia era when Demon mobilizes corruption, Mazda decides to send Zoroaster to put the world into order (Nyberg, 1388/2009: 113). The central core of all the calendars indicate that Zoroaster rose at a time when a terrible "crime" happened in the world. He appeared to reestablish the order in the world (Nyberg, the same, 114). The crime that Ahriman (Demon) committed was killing the sacred cow. However, we must notice that tappareently "the role of the sacrificer belonged to Mithra prior to be given to Demon, it is Mithra that kills the bull" (Guillmin, 1378: 53).

Therefore, the emergence of the earthly and cosmic Zoroaster has been in defense of the cow against the invasion of Mitra based both on Hots and galaxy history, respectively. It is Mithra who kills the holy cow, and these are Mithraists who perform the cow sacrifice ceremony every year. The foundation of the advent of Zarathustra was to deny this ritual; thus, it is Devi in the Zoroastrian religious culture that was killing the holy cow. Therefore, Zarathustra introduced Mithra as the Devil and the main enemy of Ahuramazda and the Zoroastrian pure religion. In contrast to Mitra, who was entitled as Ahriman, he created or raised up Ahura Mazda, the creator and the superior god.

The Zarathustra struggle was in address to the Mihra rite sacrificing the cows in the caves and drinking the drinking inebriant Hoom drink" (Hints, 1386: 75) Zarathushtra refrains from mentioning the name of Mitra - who boldly goes to fight with him. Only the drift of his words show that his enemy is Mithra and Mithraist's Moghs in this war (Rajabi, 1380/2001: 53). All the evidence suggests Zoroaster's continual controversy with Mitra and Mithraists (ibid, 64). Zoroaster has turned against all the side-effects of the cow's sacrifice, dancing ,being drunken and Hum drinking "(Razi, 1381, 68). The term "Aka " meaning rough and steadfast", that is a good trait for Mithra, is used in Goths for evil and malicious power and as curse word. In Shahnameh, it is in the form of "Aqwan Div" (Hot 32, 3, 5, 12, and Hot 33, cited Razi, 1381/2002, 70). Between these twain the Daevas also chose not aright, ... so that they chose the Worst Thought. Then they rushed together to Violence, that they might enfeeble the world of men" (Yasna, Hot 30, clause 4). (Zarathushtra) — But ye, ye Daevas all, and he that highly honors you, are the seed of Bad Thought — yes, and of the Lie and of Arrogance, likewise your deeds, whereby ye have long been known in the seventh region of the earth. For ye have brought it to pass that men who do the worst things shall be called beloved of the Daevas, separating themselves from Good Thought, departing from the will of Mazda Ahura and from Right. ... "(Yasna clause 2-5). Yasna 31 is all threatening and anathematizing to those who at the religious ritual sacrifice the cow and kill them: and drink Hoom " Let none of you listen to the words and commands of the follower of the Druj; for he brings house and clan and district and land into misery and destruction. Resist them with weapon". "Zarathus-tra's audiences who are threatened are Mithra's Cheifmans communities, his enemies are Kuyi and Mithraiyah's Amirs; the ceremonies he rejects are those of the Mithraists. "(Razi, 1381/2002: 246). Since they by their lore would pervert men from the best doing, Mazda uttered evil against them, who destroy the life of the Ox with shouts of joy.... and the lordship of them that seek after the Lie.... they set themselves to help the liar, and that it may be said, "The Ox shall be slain." (Yasna 32, 12-14).

In Mehrisht, there is no name of Kuwi known as the enemy of Zoroaster, but comes in the form of Keijo KAOYA next to XVARENA, and Sastery who is capable of everything is mentioned... Perhaps we are dealing with a larger country before the Achaemenid, and Sasterr is a name for

the ruler of the country. Nonetheless, Saster is mentioned in parallel with the Kuwaians, the Cripps and the Wizards in the Zoroastrian religious association... that Zara-thushtra was at battle with them (Yasht 13/135 and Yasna of 9/18). (Mithra) is the enemy of Zoroaster. Therefore, in the description of Yasna 29, Lumel considers the complaints and murmurs of the cowsas related to the followers of Mitra and Saster as their ruler "(Razi, 1381/2002: 60: 61).

Clause 29 of Mehryasht: "Thou, O Ak! art both bad and good to nations; thou, O Mithra! art both bad and good to men; thou.." Zoroaster in the Goths (Yasna 48, clause 4) is in conflict with this description: "Whoso, O Mazda, makes his thought (now) better, (now) worse, and likewise his Self by action and by word, and follows his own inclinations, wishes, and choices, he shall in thy purpose be in a separate place at last. "(Razi, 1381/2002: 71). Mithra is both defiled and the best, both peace and non-peace, that is, in the culture of Mitra, good and evil have not been isolated yet, it is a tragic culture in which right and wrong, good and bad are not categorised. This is the same culture of Mithra/contract as I mentioned earlier and before the agreement and the treaty, there are no laws and well defined goodness and badness. In contrast to Mitra, Zoroaster defines Mitra as evil and devil, and defines goodness and goodness against it. Therefore, the notions of goodness and evil are the construction of the mind of Zarathustra and they are his definitions. Thus, there is no reason there should be a connection between Zoroastrian religious concepts and being and reality. That is there is no reason what is defined in the religions as evil to be certainly evil.

When Ahuramazda was a partner to Mitra, he was only called Ahura (Guillmin, 1378/ 1999: 19) and it was after separating from the Mitra that Mazda meaning wise was added to its meaning. This is the starting point where the intellect was separated from the non-rational by expelling Mitra and its followers from the circle of reason, the basis of the religious/political/ Iranian / Zoroastrian / intellect were defined against Mithra and Mede.

Zarathustra gradually gets tougher with the ritual of Mithra when he finds a better situation among people. In Yasnah 29 about the rituals of the cow and dancing, Zoroaster condemns Mithra. It shows the gentle but effective struggle of Zarathustra with him who is separated - from the Ahura intellect (Razi, *ibid*: 71-72). In Yasna-32/10, Zarathushtra clearly criticises Mithra's religious beliefs. There are obvious indications throughout Yasna 32 and ... without mentioning the Mitra and the Mithra'i Society in which he avoids open struggle with it because of its widespread extension (*ibid*: 113). In the denunciation of Dewestan (Mitrae-ism), write: "He it is that destroys, who declares that the Ox and the Sun are the worst things to behold with the eyes, and hath made the pious into liars, and desolates the pastures and lifts his weapon against the righteous man (Goths:.) (32/10). As we said before, the first things Mithra does are the hunting of the sun and killing the cow after his birth from the core of the cliff. Because of this, Nijberg correctly recognises this piece of the Goths to be in address to the Mitraians (Nyberg, cited in Razi, *ibid*: 250), who, away from the sun and in the darkness of the caves are killing (sacrificing) the cow and dancing and cheering. The ritual of sacrifice and Homa after the sunset and in the dark caves at nights was for the satisfaction of Ahriman (Demon) who was the symbol of darkness (Razi, 1381/2002: 135).

Thus, with the Zoroastrian religious revolution, Mehrl became Dev (feint) and anti-god (Beyanki in Closka, 2008: 48). Zener and Lommel also admit that in the Gats, Mitra has been introduced as the cow killer and the sun beater (cited in Byanki, *ibid*). The silence of the Goths

itself is a sufficient reason for the fact that the reformist (Zoroaster) has not respected Mithra and even Mithra has been the subject of the Prophet's denunciation (Moulton, 1387: 61 – 62).

Yasna 48, clause 10 "When will thou smite the filthiness of this intoxicant -" Yasna 48 clause 5 obviously disapproves Humea (Guillmin, 1378/1999: 111). In the Goths, the Homa have not been mentioned. In Goths, Hot 32., clause 14, there is only a negative reference to the Homa pointing out the sacrifice that Zoroaster condemns. "Davisnah drank his Homa syrup and sacrificed a cow while drunken" (Razi, 1389: 246). Mithra'ist Medians were cowkilling in dark caves, they were tippling, cheering and dancing with Homa. The cowkilling has remained today in Pireshalayar and among the Izadis, but the Kurdish / Mithrasist dance and Hellparke has taken up the mystical form and color which I mention the reasons for it below. This dance and drunkenness and joy in the spring while bull-slaying is the same garden /Pardis we spoke of through which Zarathushtra constructed the religion and moral standards, and seized the Median heaven and happiness and ascended it to the sky.

Dewes mazn: (Mazandaran's demons) and Medes

Zoroaster's enmity with the Medes and their Mithraic rituals did not merely ended up in calling Mithra as Demon, but Zoroaster intended the Medes via Dewes mazn: (Mazandaran's demons). While respecting and sanctifying the ancient religion of the Aryans and Hindus, Zoroaster denounced the Deows or the Median gods negatively. "Bub" was the first one to discover the connection between the word deava meaning feint in Zoroastrianism with the term deava meaning "God" in Indians' religion and said that Zoroastrianism is a revolutionary religion against Aryain old ritual (Bubb, quoted by Darmster, 1382: 88). It is true that Zoroaster intended devil and feint by the term Div, but the point that Zarathustra revolted against old Aryan religion is quite base-less. Muleh correctly states that the Goths have a special connection with the Vedas, and Zarathushtra did no correction in the ancient religion and in case some transformation took place, they were spontaneous, not the Zarathustra's act (Mule, quoted from Boyce, 1384/2005: s103). Ahura was before Zoroaster, Zarathustra rised him to a higher level and increased the moral responsibility of man and he also did not negate the previous beliefs except Diwasna" (Bois, Alixani, the same: 108). Thus, the Zoroastrian revolution and the stricture was against Median Divasna not against the Indian and Iranian religion. Darius and Xerxes' strictness - see below – was as well only against Medians. There are two other reasons to prove that Zoroaster's hatred was merely toward Median Mithra and Medes. First, Zoroaster called Mithra as Demon and second, he called the Medes as the Mazn Dao (the Mazandaran Demons) and all the devilish Demons of the sacred book of Zoroastrian, i. e. Vendidad followed terming the Medes as Demon and feints by Zoroaster.

The geographic position of Daoi Mazina, Mazandaran, is now the northern region of Iran. Apparently, the first serious encounters of the invading Iranians with indigenous Medians happened in the north of present Iran where the memory of these conflicts and the struggle against the Mazandaran deons has remained in the Persian mythology. The north of Alborz area was a part of the Great Media and it was the northeastern part of Media. It was in the same area where the Medes molded the term Pars meaning "rib" or "the sideways" on the new invaders. Besides, there has been some refferance to Aryan newcomers under the title of "Aribi" in the Assyrian inscriptions in the pursuit of the Medes to the Alborz area. The eastern part of the

Caspians - from Alborz to the south, that is, the Desert, was called Xwar or Hwar and then Swar (Heratzfeld. Bitá: 32). Xwar, a Median/Kurdish term meaning the sun, is the place where the sun rises from. Khorasan and Khwarazm are also Kurdish names. The word "Xweri" meaning unethical is a Kurdish word that has been derived from Xwer (he tlight, the sun). This word means both the east, the place of sunrise and the place of the wild and uncivilized people constructed in address to the newcomer Aryans. The name of the Caspian Sea (Xazer) is also derived from the Casies (ibid .: 12). The migration of the tribes - Aryan, Ghaderi - to Xwar or Swar was carried out about 900 BC (ibid .: 32). As we have already said, the Casies were indigenous people and one of the main tribes of the constituting the Medes, and the Lului and Guti tribes and ... all come from a racial and linguistic group called Cassi or Caspian (Herczfled quoted by Feri, 1344: 103). The human geography of the Medes included up to the Alborz area and northern parts of the current Iran. This is also seen in the writings of the Assyrian kings in which Sargen speaks of the powerful and distant Medes at the frontier with the Aribi of the east (Alif, 2009: 288), i. e. Aryans or Iranians appeared in the easternmost parts of the Mede in the Sargin period. The Assyrian kings also have followed the powerful Medes to the Bacon Mountain, which is Alborz (Curtis, 1390: 177). The first encounters of Aryans with the aboriginals have taken place in the northern regions of present Iran, where it is the easternmost point of the Medes sovereignty.

In one of these old myths, there is the story of Tesias and the battle with Persodas, who pledged to keep on the war on Iran. In this narrative, they called them "Cadosians" who lived on the shores of the Caspian Sea and Gilan and they were natives there. "(Hertzfeld, Bitá: 43). It is not clear for us whatelss the origin of this old legend includes, but the legend of the Cadosian is about the struggle against the Iranians and Persodas people are probably the same Pars. "Cadosians were also of Median tribes and they were of the same race as Caspians" (Kalan,1375: 258) who lived in the northern parts of today Iran, who immigrated to the Aran region due to the invasion of the Aryans . "Even in the era of Darius III, Cadosians did not come under the domination of the Persians, and they were allies of the Medes and they were even from one origion with the Medes." (Aliyev, 1988: 191) During the Qobad period, a rebellious tribe called Kadishian lived in Nisibin, apparently the Shoan tribe is a reminder of them (Kalan, the same: 258). The first encounters of the Aryans in the western regions, which is the east Mede, were with the Median/Kurdish natives (Caspian ...). This is the same Eastern Aryan wars with indigenous people of Iran that has come under the name of the war with the Divan "(Mirzai,..1379: 132). Even today, there are some traces of the Kurdish historical presence in the northern regions of Iran. There are several neighborhoods in the Mazandaran area under the title of Kurd Koy (district)" . In Rasht, there are still places with the name of Kurd Mehala (neighbourhood)" and in the Gilaki dialect, we can encounter the names as the Khalkhali kurds and Ardabili Kurds and ... (Reza, 1883: 1385).

The Aryans called the aboriginals as the "Divan (demons)" while encountering them. "The Divans in the narrative of Iranians were a group of people who were giant and powerful; they were fighting with Iranians over the places and they had another race and religion, i. e. they believed in Dewasna ..." (Safa, 1384" 604). The Mazandaran Divan (demons) that were often Iranians' foes were gigantic and angry, but they had human-like characteristics (Curtis, (1388" 60). Mazin or Mazandaran demons meant the great and massive demons. Today, Mazin means great in Kurdish language.

Monshizadeh has accepted the existence of various Mazinans (Monshizadeh in Newlie, 2002, p. 51). This means that Mazina and Deows of Mazeño are not geographical concepts and refer to the deowworshippers (Newlli, the same: 70). According to the researchers, Mazandaran was originally another place. This name has been later given to the North of Iran (Curtis, 1388:53).the only implied mention in the Avesta to the western or central and northern parts is related to to the modifier "Mazezhna". The Avesta geographic landscape without exception is in the east of Iran, but in several places there are some references to the Deos of the Mazi-nians in the ern point of Iran (Newlli, 1381: 69). Deos of Mazines or Deow of Mazin (Ma-zandaran) is referring to the West of the Aryans, or the East of the Medes, and the points that the Assyrians called the powerful Medes (Mazin Medes). Monshizade has confirmed the relationship between the Masenan - the giants and the anti-creation of Ahriman in the first chapter of Wandidad (Newlli, the same: 51).

Maveron was occupied by the Aryans in the east of Iran, and Mazena was on the west side, where the Aryans did not occupy it. There were Derontis of Vern in the east of Iran, that is, in the west of the giant (Mazinani) demons (the same: 70). Iranians had no idea of the names of places and used traditional names to name the new mountains and rivers in their ways (ibid: 80). They moulded their mythological names on everywhere they arrived as they shaped Iranwiy's mythic concept on the land of the Medes. The prospect of the Yasht 13, like the other Yashts, was old and, more importantly, all belonging to the east and to the time before the migration of Iranian tribes to the west. The only western element is the Mazinia trait, whereas all geographical and ethnic references indicate the east (the same: 210). The only western attribute is Mazinia; thus, Mazinia refers to the west and the Medians. Therefore, the Deows gigantic (mazin) trait or the massive Deow worshippers have been used in reference to the Medes. The Mazinia Deows, which later became the Mazandaran demons, whom Kikavos and Rustam must overcome are the same Medes. Further, the relation of the Fereydoun's leg-end with Alborz mountain where he imprisoned Zahhak may be some signs of the encounters between the Iranian aryan and the world of the natives in the west of Iran (Zarrin Kob, 1368; 37). "With the invasion of the eastern Aryans, the aboriginals retreated to the west and north of the Caspian Sea, and the battle of the Pahlavans (heros) like Tahmurth with the Ma-zandaran Demons (Divans) signifies the same event "(Mirzai, 1379: 133).

As we said, the Zoroastrian revolution was against Median Mithra and his intention of De-mon worshippers and Devils were Medes. Even the term Ajidak, which connotes the ultimate evil and ugliness in Zoroastrianism and is a symbol of anti-creation of Devil, is expressed in the Address to the Medes and their last kingdom, i.e Zahak. We will return to the subject of the Ajydak in detail, but we should point out here that the Medes have been introduced as the son of the snake in ancient history. As Avesta says, the migrant Iranian-speaking ethnic groups were introduced as fighters against the snakes and bitter opponents of serpent religion, which was the religion of the inhabitants of indigenous people. Serpant on shoulder Zahak and the three head- and six muzzle dragon and ... Avesta's themes are full of stories of Iranian battles with snakes and ... the snake is a symbolic name of the people who were the native inhabitants" (Alof, 1388:172). Serpant was the totem of the Medes (Hertsfield, Hekmat, Bitá: 21). Persians have maintained the memory of these serpent worshipping people over the long centuries while they have avoided interacting with these local clans. "The linguistic connection of Mar, Mad, and Mar(g) meaning death and killer is obvious in Indo-European family of languages "(Aliyev: the same: 172). Thus, the main address of Zoroaster and Zoroastrian by terming the



devil, demon, Azhydhak were the Medes. "All demons (feints) (Zoroastrian gods) were members of Mothrism Association, so Zarathustra's aim was to attack and criticize the Mithra rite (Razi, 1381: 243). And the foundation of Iranian religion and culture and political wisdom have been developed in conflict with Median civilization. To bring more evidence to prove this, we will explore in one of the holy books of the Zoroastrians, the Vindhid (anti-Dive law) so as to find out who and what the Zoroastrians mean by Dive (feint). All the demons and hatreds of Zoroastrians have been gathered in the book of Vindhid, and it has made known all evil and devilish forces to the followers and then it has cursed them.

#### - The Vindhid Demons and the Medes

Vindhid is the name of a part of Avesta, which is around personal and public orders, rewards and deeds of people in most of its parts. In other words, the words of the Vindhid are the jurisprudential section of Avesta. Vindhid is a distorted form of the Avestan combination "vdaeva data", meaning "anti-dive law". Therefore, the anti-dive law and the law of Ahoora is incompatible with the religion and the law of the pre-Zoroastrianism (Dostkha, 1361: 314). The three parts of the Vindhid are: 1. The Izadi (divine) word and speech 2 The Anti-dive's law-3 The Decrees of the Zoroaster, i.e. the Zoroastrian Law (the same: 96). Vindhid is the Zoroastrian religious laws: the laws of Cleanliness, filthiness and sin and repentance are the main contents of the book (Christensen, 1345: 140). Azaryad at Shapur's time, who came out of the test of fire successfully and Shapur announced it as the official religion, has counted Vindhid as the most important part of the Avesta (1380: 472).

Many believe that Vindhid's book was written at the time of the Parthians. However, Schwartz correctly considered the time of its writing by the Magies as in the Achaemenid era (Schwartz, Cambridge: 1387, 794). Nyberg also recognised the time of its writing to be in Xerxes' era (Razi, *ibid*, 132). Aomstd regarded the criminal law of Darius as the essence of the book "Vindhid- "anti- Dive laws (Cook, 1383:137). Vindhid is the consolidation period of Zoroastrianism and the peace arising after the victory. In contrast to the excitement and pressure of fighting Zhydhak and evil, Vindhid is the period of consolidation and development of Zoroastrianism and complete explanation and description of the Median demons. Even those who believe Vindhid was written in the Parthian period consider it writing in the time of Mehrdad. I in 147 BC, after the conquest of Mede (Christensen, 1345:140). Whether its writing was after Darius' victory over Median Gyvmatay mater, or after Xerxes' conquest over the temple of the Median dives or Mehrdad victory in the conquest of the Media, Vindhid heralds the victory of Zoroasterianism purity and goodness over the impurity and dirt of the Median dives.

Vindhid, Chapter 3, paragraph 7, names a mountain called Arazor as a place where the Dives enter in its caves. "Where the first place is that the earth suffers the most caustic sorrow there," Ahura Mazda replied: "This place is the gorge of Arazor where on its top a group of Dives rush forward near the Deroj (Hell)" (Vindhid, Purdavood: 29) Erzurum is in northern Kurdistan (Turkish Kurdistan). In Bandehes, chapter 12, clause 1 - Wedding - Chapter 33, paragraph 5, "Hamarzora is the headquarters of the Dives and the site of gate of the Hell. in the Pahlavi resources, this mountain is in the northwestern regions of Iran (Mad, Ghaderi) (Kahlan, 1375: 79). There is a village in Horman called "Diveznava", Dive is the same Demon (feint) and "znava" means rising, that is, the rise of demon or Divsna.

Widgegren is one of those who considers the names of the Vendidad demons as the same with the Median names. "There has been a great deal of effort to match the name of the demons in Vendidad - many unknown demons - with the names of the Medes ... One of them is a Devi called Kundi (Vindhid Fargrad II, clause 9). It is a female Devi which corresponds with the male kund, i.e kunda (Vindhad 19, clause 41). ".Offer up the sacrifice to the holy Sraosha, that the holy Sraosha may smite down the fiend Kunda 8, who is drunken without drinking. He will fall upon the men of the Drug, the slothful ones ', the wicked Daeva-worshippers, who live in sin. In this section, Kund is the name given to the bang. However, the relationship between Kond or Wendy and Bang is not exactly for appeasment ... but arises from the fact that Kund exists in the Mani ritual with a Median- Parthian background. There-fore, these Divans surely belonged to the old Median group of Gods that, with the spread of Zoroastrianism to the West, were disreputed especially after Mogies accepted Zoroasterian-ism. "(Widengren, 167: 1377). He considered the reference to paragraph 8 of clause 73 of Vendidad, which denotes eating dead bodies among the Dive worshippers and the Zoroas-ter's enemies, in accordance with the myth of eating Harpag's child by Median Astyag (ibid, 169). It is true that there is a similarity between Vandida description of the demons and mythical Styag, but this similarity is not establishing a correspondence between the Zarathus-tra's theory and the reality of the Medes, but both of them are arising from the same source and they are the result of the propaganda of the Persian Zoroastrians against the Median Mithraists. The same Zoroastrians who described the Median feints and gorgon or sorceress and ugly constructed the myth of eating Harpag's baby by Median Astyagh. The Persian Zoroastrians made everything contrary to their authority as ugly and caitiff. They themselves attributed evil aspects , such as Ajidak, for the Medes, and then described the same attributes for Mithraists who were "the other" and "Zoroastrian" demons. They matched "the other" of the Persians, who was the same Medes, with the other and "non" Zoroaster, who was Mithra, which was the result of the unity of Zoroastrian religion with the Achaemenid policy, and part of this alliance was due to the common enemy of Mede / Mithra.

A chapter of Vendidad names a list of unclean places in which the Mede is one of those unclean places and Pars is pure and far from evil. "(Razi,1385: 66). Many Iranian and foreign scholars have known Moghan as Medians and the writers of Vendidad. We do not discuss this here but in the next chapters, we will discuss the issue of their non-Median being and also the book of Vindhid and its homology with the Goths. Here it is necessary to mention that if Moghan were Median and the scribes of Vandidad, why did they show Pars off as clean and Mede as impure?

"Prior to the advent of Zoroastrianism, the gods of Deow were worshiped, but they were deprived of worshipping in the Zoroastrian religious movement and the god of Ahouramazda became the Supreme God and Deows were dipilated. The most important of the ancient Median gods that were removed were Indre, Seorah, Mitra and ... The time of this transfor-mation was at the end of the Medes and the early Achaemenids era (Razi, the same, 86). An-others group of Deows referred to in paragraph 43 of the 19th Fargard include: "Angra Mainyu the deadly, the Daeva of the Daevas ; I ndra the Daeva, Siuru the

Daeva, Naunghaithya the Daeva, Taurvi and Zairi1, Aeshma of the wounding spear 2, Akatasha the Daeva 3, Zaurva ', baneful to the fathers, Btiiti the Daeva 6, Driwi e the Daeva, Daiwi 7 the Daeva, Kasvi 8 the Daeva, Paitisha II the most Daeva-like amongst the Daevas. They are among the fearsome and thoughtful Dives having a lot of significance and moving from one

side to the other. This is the collection of old gods who were worshiped in the Medes, and Moghan called them demons, and also they were among the Hittites and the Mit-tanis" (Razi, the same, 103-102). The Vindhadad included the gods of the ancient Media in the number of evils (ibid .: 103). The acursed Wandidad Dives were the Median gods and there was a striking contradiction between the Median beliefs and the Moghan beliefs that this hostility continued even after the apparent tendency of Moghan towards the west Zara-thustra in such a way that Median gods became accursed in Wandidad" (Razi, the same: 105-104). It is true that the Dives were the Median gods, but first, there was no god in the sense of being worshipped among the Medes, which I have discussed earlier and the second, Ha-shem Ratii has simplified the matter as if Moges' calling the Medes sanctities as Dive in Ven-didad was a personal issue resulting from Moghan's rancour. While the issue is far beyond being individual and it was the ritual contradiction in the continuation of calling Mithra as Demon by Zarathustra and it reflected the hatred and hostility of Pars with Mede.

In paragraph 11, clause 9, a group of the Dives are also mentioned:

'I drive away Aeshma 1,

I drive away the Nasu,

I drive away direct defilement,

I drive away indirect

defilement.

[I drive away Khrtl, I drive away Khrtlighni 8 ; I drive

away Bflidhi, I drive away Bflidhiza 4 ; I drive away

Kundi, I drive away Kundiza.11]

'I drive away the yellow Bt1shyasta, I drive away the

long-handed Bf1shyasta 8 ; [I drive away Mt1idhi7, I

drive away Kapasti.

I drive away the Pairika ...

"All these demons have been the gods worshiped by the Medes, such as Buddhi, Budhira, Kuandi, Kondija and Bushinost ... One of the tribes of Mede, in Herodotus' word (the first Book, 101) was called Buddhiot or Buddhdeowi and a Median tribe named Budhi were worshiping Budhi (the word Budhi means scenting) that was the goddess of femininity. Besides, they name the name Kundi, the female demon of the female, and a male demon called Kunda (Rhythm, the same:.) (105 others are busyansta busyansta, the demon is lazy and the heavy sleep is on the other side - G It is believed that the word "western Iran" has been among the Medes. It also seems to have been a narcotic substance from a plant that was sown in wine and a state of attraction (the same: 106). Another tribal name is Basheshi, not named after Dave Bashes but from The sentiment of the Bash (the same) is mentioned. Another Devi, called Boee T buiti, is a god of happiness and happiness among the Medes, or Baudio means happiness and

cheerful, or the substance of the diva, called the Ayehya. Section 21, clause 17, which was Epasia in the ancient India, meaning the rebellious and savage, which has also been the trait of indiré and Mores (the same). These Deo and Pari (feri) gods are called dehu-périque, who ancient Medians believed in them. Other median gods were demoted into the Divan (ibid, 108107). Pairica is the name of another demon in Vendidad. It is a magic or fairy woman's name or a charming one who deceives people with her beauty (Vindhid, section 1, paragraph 19).

Perica or Peri, which is a symbol of beauty and sexual attractiveness, has been like a goddess among the Median earthly and Diosinism that changed into fein and hecate among the Apollonian / religious culture of the Zoroastrian Iranians. Périca can be compared to Sierras in the Greek mythology that were a symbol of womenly instincts and beauty. However, to establish his own manly wisdom, Adisius, or it is better to say Apolonianism and anti-Dionism Homer who did not take notes of Dionism god introduces them as a pig and a dangerous beast. Introducing Pairica (fairy) and Sirsas as Demon and pig illustrate transition of two Iranian and Greek civilizations, from the Dionysian / terrestrial culture, to an apollonian / metaphysical culture that they imposed reason, religion and general principles on the personal life and the instincts of individuals, and they sacrificed biological freedom of the individuals for the sake of hollow concepts of reason and religion. For this reason, in both civilizations, the Medes were presented as Ajayid (serpant on shoulder Zahak) and serpant-like tress Medosa. Because Medes/Kurds had cultural or Dionysian / terrestrial anti-cultural, they were known as Jen, snake-like tress Meosa, unwise Gothian, the decent or stock of Tayyat, and others in the heavenly religions and metaphysical cultures. With the consolidation of the manly moral wisdom, Adisius prevents a return to biological emancipation, since Adisius needs his men's combat power. Just as the capitalism, to utilize the workers energy well, limited the sexual relationship to marital relations and it continued the Christian piety through constructing scientific rules to sacrifice mankind biology for the sake of social stipulations to produce the wealth of the minority. Foucault was against these constructed ethics, which considered the soul to be the cage of the body and the only liberty as bodily freedom. The Median Mithraeans sacrificed the cow, drank and rejoiced. Zarathustra, like Adisius, by fixing the supernatural wisdom, blocked the human biofreedom and internalized the sacrifice. It means that Instead of sacrificing the cow, he sacrificed the human being and biology at the foot of the hollow concepts of goo thought and ... .

The demons in vindidad are Jinn, Fairy and ghushl that they must repelled them through epode and invocation (Razi, the same: 92). It is not baseless that Kurds also were known as Jinn and Satan in the era of Islam whether by Shiites or Sunnis. Ja'far-e Sadegh, quoted from Majlisies' Baharol –Anwar, explicitly says: "Kurds are from Jen (fein) descendant". Calling Kurds as Jen by many of the Islamic historians and prolocutors from Shafi'ya to Mas'udi-we have already mentioned – are in the continuation of calling the Kurds / Medes as demon (dive) by Zoroastrians. "The word Satan "devil" is derived from Shade or Shidan, who was one of the gods of the Mitra, entering the Sami world and becoming Satan "(Safi Zadeh, 1385: 32). There may be a relation between the word Satan and the words "Shaïda or shit in Kurdish. Shit means insane or someone who ignores the laws and civilization. Satan was also rejected as the result of turning against the imposed rules. Shaïda means the emancipation of instincts.

- Zoroaster's dualism against the Mede

The Zoroastrian religion, in contrast to the intellectual interpretation of western and Iranian commentators, is, as Henning, Bois, and Zener have explored, a dualistic religion, and was essentially developed against monotheism. In Henning's opinion, "dualist movements have been a protest against monotheism, and duality was a response to the problem of evil, which is not consistent with faith in the good and the supreme God" (Henning, quoted by Gaiman, 1363: 13). Therefore, Henning considers the best way to understand the Zoroastrian ritual as a dualistic movement in this point that we can see the opposition to monotheism in it (Henning, quoted by Gaiman, 1378 (2000): 13). Spiegel also believes that before dualism, there has been the idea of a rigid and fanatic monotheism (Spiegel, quoted by Gaiman, 1363: 13). Of course, monotheism goes beyond the meaning of the only God which we will clarify our intention of it in the following.

Zarathushtra designed a perfect and infinite goodness that nothing arises from it except goodness; therefore, he should have contrived a second principle to explain the cosmic disorder and the miseries of life "(Gamman, 1378: 2). Yasna, Hymn 45, clause 2: "I will speak of the Spirits twain at the first beginning of the world, of whom the holier spoke thus to the enemy: "Neither thought, nor teachings, nor wills, nor beliefs, nor words, nor deeds, nor selfs, nor souls of us twain agree" (Razi, 1389: 179). Now the two primal Spirits, who reveal themselves in vision as Twins, are the Better and the Bad, in thought and word and action. And between these two the wise ones chose aright, the foolish not so. And when these twain Spirits came together in the beginning, they created Life and Not-Life, and that at the last Worst Existence shall be to the followers of the Lie, but the Best Existence to him that follows Right. Of these twain Spirits he that followed the Lie chose doing the worst things; the holiest Spirit chose Right, he that clothes him with the massy heavens as a garment. So likewise they that are fain to please Ahura Mazda by dutiful actions" (Yasna 30, para. 5-3, quoted from Multon, 1387: 54). Before interpreting the misery and the evil, which prompted Zarathustra to respond and processed the God of the goodness, we must clarify our meaning about monotheism based on the abovementioned passage here that other scholars have not noticed. Zarathustra says that "the two primal spirits ... that were in the beginning ... twain spirits ... the better and bad ...." compare it with this statement from Mithra who is not not God, like Ahura Mazda, and Mithraism does not have a prophet like Zoroaster: "Thou, O Mithra! – ak- art both bad and good to nations; thou, O Mithra! art both bad and good to men; thou, O Mithra! keepest in thy hands both peace and trouble for nations " (Mehryasht 29). The monotheism that Zarathustra presented dualism was neither the only metaphysical god, nor the god of evil, which Zarathustra would have created the god of goodness against it. The concept of Mitra means a conception related to preduelism that is prior to goodness / evil since, as we have already explained, the agreement / Mithra preceded the goodness / evil. Before explaining it in detail, we must explain the evil that Zoroaster against which constructed the god of goodness. What was this cosmic disorder and the wickedness of life that induced Zarathustra to devise the second evil force of Demon (Ahriman).

Goldener and Bartholomew believed that Zarathustra's birthplace was in Media from where he was forced to escape to the west "(Gamman, 1363, 4). Professor Jackson also believes that Zarathustra was born in the west of Iran and preached his message there without success but eventually he gained success in Balkh "(in Multon: 1387, 40). To what land shall I go to flee, whither to flee? From nobles and from my peers they sever me, nor are the people pleased with me [.....], nor the Liar rulers ... "(Yasna 46, clause 1). Bartolme thinks Zoroaster formed the

image of evil in his mind after being dispelled of the Mede and objective example of evil in the doctrine of Zoroastrianism were the Medes, and the Mithraic religion. If we investigate carefully, Mede and Mithra are the evil image in Zarathustra's mind in contrast to which he processed the God of goodness. What does all these mean? That is, the image of evil/Demon did not have any meaning in Zarathustra and all was pre-evil then. Monotheism meant that the dualism objective/subjective, soul / body God / Satan had not been formed at that time. This is the first of its recent Zoroaster, Mithra's own land and subsequent growth would seem not. This presentation of the Spirit and God in front of Mitra, in the words of Hegel, was the beginning of history, and the beginning of the history mistake that had passed thousands of years ago, with the advent of the prophets of Dionysius / Mitra, Nietzsche and Foucault, humanity returned to its original home, instinct and joy. Good and evil do not have meaning in the realm of the world; it is the foundation of the minds of Zarathustra and Plato. It was the political power that recorded the Zarathustra plan as the good in history, i.e. the Achaemenid / Pars political power.

Nonetheless, why are the Medes and Mithraic ritual became the image of evil in Zoroaster's religious doctrine? What were the Medes and Mithra that forced Zarathustra to redefine all of the cosmic order and create dualism contrary to all previous religions and mythologies?

In all previous religions and mythologies, it is the God of goodness who creates the world by killing a monster. Marduk, the worshipable god of Babylon creates the world from anew by killing the monster of Tiamat and from the body parts of Tiamat; Yahwa, the God of the Jews creates the world by killing Leviathan. In mythological culture of Germany, Odin creates the world by killing the Immers. In the Greek mythology, Zeus created the world and revived the cosmic order by killing Kronos. In all myths of the world, the worshipping god creates the order of the world by killing the three-headed and six- muzzled monsters; hence, goodness overcame evil. However, why is it not the victim but the sacrifice who is the symbol of goodness? Why did Mithra, who became Demon later, kill the sacred cow and the first human being and not vice versa in which it is Ahura Mazda- Kaoumas that must have killed Mitra / Ahriman?

Doshn Giman, who found out this paradox, actually clears the problem instead of solving and analyzing it. In his view, " the Zoroastrians did not understand or did not want to understand that sacrifice is for creation with regard to this point that the murderer of these two creatures (the cow and the first human being) have become evil, (Gamen, 1378, 52). First, as we said earlier, the work of Mithra is not sacrificing the cow but it is fighting and killing the cow. Secondly, in many other myths, it is the good creature that sacrifices something and it is the monster and evil force that is sacrificed. Nevertheless, in Iranian mythology, it is good creature (the holy cow and the first man) that are sacrificed and it is the evil force of Mitra / the Devil who kills or in the word of Gayman sacrifices. Thus, the problem is not so easy for Gayman that he is trying to solve it. Besides, Can one be courageous enough to say that Zoroaster and the whole Zoroastrians did not understand the issue and only Gayman understood it? Certainly Zoroaster and Zoroastrians have understood the point much better than, contrary to the myths of other nations, the sacrificer was introduced as the evil and the victim as good and Ahurai.

Therefore, the difference was not Zoroastrian negligence, nor the mistake committed by the Zoroastrian religion. The issue is far beyond the personal and intertextual decision of Zoroastrian religion. Zarathustra not only did not neglect the point, but he understood the very

fact that he presented the sacrificer as the Devil. The difference between the Zarathustra religion and other religions does not arise as the result of the inherent difference of Zoroaster's religion with other religions, but it comes up as the result of the difference in the environment of Zarathustra's emergence with other environments where other prophets emerged. Therefore, this difference made Zarathustra's religion different from other religions in which in contrast to the monotheism of all other religions, the Zoroastrian religion brought about with itself the absolute dualism. However, what was the peripheral / cultural difference that Zarathustra emerged in it?

As we quoted from Bartholomew, Zarathustra appeared in Mede, or at least, after becoming familiar with the Mede's religious culture, the image of the evil world was formed in his mind. The religions or prophets of other nations did not carry out revolution, but the reformation. The Arabs of the ignorance (Jahali) era still worshiped God, but they attached partners to the God, the Prophet only made Allah higher and unique, and made him purged from a partner. Jesus also emerged in a religious and metaphysical environment. He only transformed the relationship between man and God that was based on anger and power before his time and he turned it into a relationship of love and friendship. Zarathustra also performed a reformation not a revelation in the Indian mythology as Moule and Boyce correctly understood it. The Zoroastrian revolution was against earlier Median Mithra, but unlike other prophets, Zoroaster encountered a culture and a ritual in the Medeh / Mitra cultural environment that was contrary to the habit of all the metaphysical and religious cultures. A culture that preferred the earth, instinct and body to the sky, spirituality and spirit. A culture whose totem was serpent and lion, not eagle and cow. A culture whose religion was dance, joy and freedom, not the pray, invocation and worship. Therefore, contrary to other prophets, Zarathustra could not define its principles based on a prepared background because there existed the Median material culture of Mitra. Unlike the culture of other nations, the victim was not the earthly creatures but heavenly/ Ahoorian (holy cow and kiumars). Zoroaster could not question or ignore the principle of sacrifice, nor could it represent the sacrificer without regard to the existing culture. For this reason, not only he accepted the principle of sacrifice of the initial time, but unlike other nations and mythologies, it was the victim not the sacrifice which was pure and good. The culture of other nations was founded on a fundamentally metaphysical basis, from Baal to Mordock and Allah in which only the names and gods had changed but has always a heavenly God and religious culture had ruled taken from the god of Ham-murabi to the god of Muhammad. However, Zarathustra emerged in a culture that neither worshiped the heavenly God nor did they have a metaphysical culture. Mitra's ceremony was held far from the sun and sky in the darkness of the cave. Their popular totem was snake and lion which were the symbol of evil and sensuality in the religious cultures. Therefore, the culture of monotheism did not answer the question. The myth of choice and the two spirits - Ahura / Ahriman - is also related to the existence of Mitra, the other mythology of Babylon, Greece, and ... was founded based on the sovereignty and hegemony of the good spirit from the beginning. Zarathustra did not emerge in a vacuum; he emerged in a culture that God and not metaphysical culture did not sovereign the world; it was the Media - a terrestrial power and Dionisius / instinctive culture which was ruling over the world whose sovereignty could not be answered with destiny and divine expediency. It was a sovereignty that consciously had anti-metaphysical culture which did not satisfy the Zarathustra's inquisitive and curious mind to retell the former myths.

He knew that the reality of Iran is not the reality of Babylonia that in which every ruling government should be a metaphysical one. An earthly power that considered the serpent as sacred was ruling, an anesthetic power. All these power was not solved with God's wisdom theorem. Contrary to Boys's theory, that believed it was the strength of their bandits and their plunderers that led to the formation of the evil mentality in Zoroaster's mind (Bois, 1386, 135). It was the culture and the power of the Mede that caused him to contemplate around the existence of two souls. If there only exists the God of goodness, why has evil progressed to such an extent? To the extent that a holy king such as Jamshid has been affected by it - we will come to it then; thus, he presented a two-spirit theory and he made the earthly gods of Mede, like Mitra, as evil and he himself caused the Iranian-Indian culture to appear as Ahura Mazda and the goodness. Since there existed the Median material culture having an influence, it presented the theory of human authority. All this tendency towards the Median Mithra cul-ture could not be solved by divine wisdom; the responsibility of all of the people's tendency toward the Ajdahak could not just be put on God's destiny. If you do this, the legitimacy of purity and the responsibility of Ahuramazda is brought under question and it makes humans think and doubt about the goodness of God. He regarded man responsible and free to take responsibility from God. In fact, knowing the human as free was not paying attention to him/her, but it was disclaiming responsibility from God and placing the responsibility for the sin on the shoulders of the man just to mobilize the people against Zhydhak. He knew them themselves as responsible for the evil to provoke them. Inevitably, the path to get the con-science free from the punishment for the sin is in the absolute obedience of Zarathustra and the Zarathustra god later being replaced by the Achaemenid political order. In fact, the religious hatred of Zoroaster was combined with the political hatred of the Persian ethnic group and formed the Zoroaster's political destiny; therefore, the alliance of the Zarathustra religion with the Persian Empire was in opposition to the Mitra / Mede and it was giving power to the man for the same warrior power against the Mede.

Mitra was the same as the Tyamath of Babylon (Merdok), the Leviathan of the Jews (Yah-wa), and the Greek Kronos (Zeus), who were killed by the sacred gods of Meredek, Jehovah and Zeus, respectively; hence, the world was created from their organs. The other of Arshia, like the Jew and Greece, was inferred from Zoroaster, or, like Babylon, was constructed before the Zoroastrianism in contrast to Mitra. Besides, the Medes are also notorious as the descent of Tayyamat and Gothi, and even the male root of the Satan flower originates from the Kurd, and the cave of ignorance, Medusa and Hades of Greece are also images of Mitra, so what is the difference?

Mardok and Jehovah killed Timat and Leviathan, but Ahuramazda did not kill Ahriman until the end of the world, just as Fereyduun imprisoned Zahak until the end of his life, and he did not kill him until the advent of Soshyat. Ahuramazda turned Mithra into Demon (fiein), then, through mutating his real nature, he changed him (Mithra) into Zoroastrian. The treatment of the Iranian gods with the difference to the Semitic and the Jewish gods became the fate of the Iranian politicians behaviour. Arabs / Sami, Turks and... kill and annihilate Kurds, the Assyrians destroyed the Medes, but the Achaemenids and subsequent Iranian dynasties subjugated and enslaved them not by slaying but by transshipping in the form of another identity. The Iranians make their opposition as contentless, baseless and then turn their identity into their own through transshipping it. The Arabs and the Turks carry out punishment but the



Iranians transshape in addition to punishment and care. Other nations had their own civilizations to destroy Mitra (Leviathan, Tiamot, Medusa)

On the one hand, Zarathushtra was Median himself, and on the other hand, Persians who were the Zarathushtra allies in the rejection of the Medes, were semi-savage migrators lacking any culture and identity, which, if they completely eliminated and destroyed the Mithra and culture of Mithra, it would somehow be a cultural suicide for them. The reason to support this claim is the way Tahmourth and Jamshid behaved with the Divan, who, instead of killing them, learn writing and science. The Zoroastrian concepts are Median taken from Ferahwashi to FerahIzadi, they only change their content. The survival of Ahriman/Zohak Mithra was the survival of the rebellion and the conflict of Mede and Pars is seen in Gomat and Mazdak. The metaphysical contrast reflects the political opposition and cultural overloading of the term "Pars / Zarathushtra" from Mede / Mitra. Unlike the other religions that were turning against evil, Zoroaster was brought up at the center of the evil and accompanying it from the beginning. It was due to this reason, that is, the cultural and residential hegemony of Mede and evil that even after his victory, he designed the idea of survivor/Soshiant. The idea of the end of the world and the advent of the survivor came into the Jews and Christians from Zoroasterianism, since unlike in Zoroastrianism that god and goodness had governance, in Mithraism, it was Mithra, Mede and the evil that were prevailing. Inevitably, Zoroaster founded the dualism and the moral struggle of the man. Because it was the bads that were ruling, he introduced the idea of the emergence of the savior was offered for revenge, which is why, unlike the gods of Greece and India, and ... who are mischievous, the god of Iran / Zoroastrian is moral and determined. India and Greece had no political / territorial struggle with the Mede, Zoroaster / Persia, apart from the land of Mede, had no place for the realization and expansion of their religion. The political hatred of Persia, on the one hand, which sought to loot and conquer and the sovereignty of the Mede did not allow it and Astyag built Psaragud which meant watching the Persian swindler to prevent them from plunder - on the other hand, Zoroaster was expelled from the Mede and he had seen evil with his own eyes in Mede; thus, Zoroastrian personal / metaphysical hatred and political and ethnic hatred of Persia united against the common enemy of the Medes / Mitra, on the one side, conveying the religiousness of the Persian people and, on the other hand, marked the political appreciation of Zarathushtra. Zarathushtra collapsed with the decline of Sassanid political rule. However, Pars in the 21st century calls for the issuance of religion and the struggle between the good and the evil or Jihad.

The gods were victorious from the beginning in India and Greece, and ... they did not need victory to seek human help with determination. Zarathushtra presented the thought of duality Soshiant, and human freedom for the struggle against evil in annihilating Mede and Mithra. That is why history literally began with the advent of Zoroaster and the Persians in its true sense. The history begins with the break from the eternal time of the myth, with a historical and horizontal time, that at the end of the time, the Soshiant will appear for revenge. The gods were victorious earlier and the eternal time was the repetition of the work of the gods but with the advent of Zoroastrianism and the Persians, the gods who were defeated and sacrificed, the time was not the repetition of the work of the gods, but the fulfillment of the will of the God's will to avenge the devils and it was the divine realization and the victory of the gods on the earth. This is why the history of the beginning and the struggle of the heavenly and terrestrial city got significant along with the emergence and will of man in the continuation of the will of God to take revenge.

The idea of paradise and hell, which is the result of the requital and good actions, is Zoroastrianism to motivate its followers to fight the evil of Mithraism. "The thought of Ahriman is also Zoroastrian. Before the story of Ayob in the Torah, there is no mention of Satan. This is the snake that deceives Eve "(The Torah quoting from the introduction on the Sophocles' Tabay legend). In the thought of western Asia (Sami), there is also no news of Satan, Timothy is killed by Meadok (Bahar, 421: 1384). Thus, the concept of Satan, Paradise, and Hell entered into other religions from Zoroastrianism. What is the threat of the killed Tyamat to mobilize the people? But the imprisoned devil (like today's enemy) is a constant threat to mobilization and war.

Zarathushtra, by seeing the evil Median world in Mithraism, made the Mede / Mitra as the devil / Satan, and he constructed Ahura Mazda/Goodness in contrast to it and led to the belief in dualism. This prerequisite for dualism is human responsibility and authority. The proper use of this freedom and the achievement of the happiness of the Hereafter and eternal Paradise is the struggle against evil and Jihad in the queue of Ahura Mazda, and the objective symbol of Ahriman and Ajiadak were the Medes. Therefore, the fight against the Medes equaled the struggle against the filth and the evil. This Zarathustra thought that considered its Median opponents as Ahriman and Ajiadak has put its bage on Iran's political wisdom from the Cyrus' time to the contemporary period, put their own ideas. Cyrus also referred to his own Median oppositions as Ajiadak, Darius as the liar and the enemy of Asha and Ahura; the entire Vandid demons are Median, and the Median tribes became known as Zandigh, the infidels, and the Jins later and as the agents of imperialism, the separatists, the enemies of God and Satan in the contemporary period.

For Zoroastrians, "the Zoroastrian god is good, the rest of the gods are only good to themselves, but they are not good because they have accepted the reality of the evil. Thus, their god is responsible for the evil unless the evil would be separate from the goodness similar to Zoroaster "(Zener, 1377, 58). God is wise and conscious; hence, creation of the sensible motives ... on the part of God is good and the evil is not from God "(the same: 60). Considering the evil as separate from the main principle of goodness eliminates the possibility of any reconciliation with it and the material world in the Zarathustra religion. Unlike other religions that know the root as the same, the acceptance of the reality of the evil in the world by other religions reduces human responsibility. However, Zarathustrainism attributes all the evil to man presupposing the purity of the material world who has violated Ahura. Therefore, de-structing the evil and not correcting the evil practically is the main issue in Zoroasterianism and the bad man is the result of it. Everything that is out of Ahura Mazda religion is devilish; therefore, the Zoroastrian ruler has legitimacy to eliminating all of them with the sword. "The Zoroastrian religion is based on obedience of Asha and his disobedience leads to the denial of true knowledge, goodness and sanctity, wealth and position, ..., the Divasnan (Devilish people) are bereft of the knowledge, wealth and ... " (Razi, 1380, 120).

God is neither responsible for the torment of man, nor remorseful for the creation of the man like Yahwa and there is news regarding Ayoub's tribulation, God is good (Zener, the same, 59). All evil and grief are exonerated from God and they are all fallen on the shoulders of evil. This is a sort of puppet-making to put all sorts of misfortunes burden on someone else in order to gain the ruling legitimacy. In Zoroastrian religion, any Promoteism and rebellion of mankind against God is destroyed. All evil falls on the shoulder of the other side, i.e. evil and it would

remove the possibility of any criticism and protest ...; the man would become the tool for the domination of Mzdayasnan/the king on the pretext of fighting alien evil and attaining prosperity instead of an independent struggle on part of the man. The root of all the evil comes from the other, and the meaning of reform in this dual world is nothing but obedience to the leaders of the religion and subordination. Obedience means reformation, and prosperity, rebellion and revolt mean become the agent of the evil and the imperialist. If God was one and the source of evil came from God too, it would be possible to protest and re-form. However, in the double world of the goodness and evil, reform means pure obedience and objection means being devil. Ayoub could object to the God for the sake of his suffering as Armia objects to the man, Chereistian to the God of the Jesus, Zeus or Allah. In Zoroastrianism, there would remove the possibility of any Promotism and objection. In Zoroasteriaism, unlike Jermia, there exists protest against man since human being is chaste. Thus, if the man is diverted a little, he would face the devil and must be eliminated; he would not be guided and he would be exited out of the human circle, and he would take the title of demon and devil. Since there is no possibility of impunity in man, s/he has become devilish. There is no possibility of criticizing and protesting to the human, but excluding him. If there were a god, they would say that you, the human, became deviant from God. The return of evil was from God's side; therefore, it was possible to take back evil with prayer or deed. Nonetheless, considering the Devil as evil, becoming evil was unreturnable. Ajayadk and killing ... protesting against God is also impossible because he is not accountable for the badness and evil. For this reason, Darius who massacred 18,000 Median people on one day became representative of Ahuramazda and Anushirvani, who massacred 6,000 people on a day, is introduced as just and righteous. Opponents, who are the survivors of evil, must be eliminated.

In Iranian religious culture, revenge and reaction have always been posed instead of action and killing. In the mythology of other nations, the god of goodness will triumph over evil and they do not need to take revenge. These are the divan (Demons) and the devils that must take revenge of the gods and the power of goodness. However, in Iranian mythology this is the devil /Mithra who kills good beings of AhuraMazda. Therefore, Zarathustra emerges for the revenge of the spirit of the cow. The essence of Iranian culture and the philosophy of the advent of Zarathustra is based on revenge. "In Shahnameh (the letter of the king), everyone takes revenge even after several generations ... Fereydoun is revenging on his forefather, Jam-shid, Manouchehr, the vengeance of Iraj, Keikhosro, the revenge of Siavash and Bahman Revenge of Esfandiar ... even after several generation" (Safa, 138: 238).

After escaping from the advanced and urban community of the Mede to the peasant/pastoral community of the East, Zarathushtra found a more trustable position for its ghostly spirit. However, Zarathushtra was unsuccessful in synchronizing the people of the east to his religion and against Mede. Zoroaster's metaphysical hatred of the Mithraans and the sacrifice of their cow was not understood for the pastoral and flat people of the east. For this reason, Zarathustra cleverly matched all of his metaphysical hatred of Mede and Mithra with the livelihood concerns of the people. "The priests and the Kerins on the one hand and the nomadic people on the other hand put pressure on the people" (Razi, 1380: 107). Mehrians sacrificed the cow in the darkness of the cave; henceforth, they called them Cripen, the word "Qorban" is derived from Kerpen (Moghadam, 1380: 2), i.e. the Cripenas -the Mithras- who are the desert people stealing the livestock. The eastern tribes were stealing the cow and plundering and they were threatening the livelihood safety of the people and the community that Zarathustra inhabited in

it. Zoroaster intermingled the cow-killing of Median Mithraists with plunder and cow-theft of the eastern people to seek people's accompany. The sacrifice of the cow by the Mithraist was a symbolic action and it was carried out once a year; the organizers of the ceremony themselves funded it and it did not harm anyone or it was secured by the Median government. However, Zoroaster deliberately conducted the livelihood hatred of the people towards the cattle sacrificers provoking the people against the Mitraians. In fact, the seed of Turanian, who were the Medians, becoming eastern was sewn not only from the time of the Sasanians, but also from Zarathustra time himself. Mixing his personal / metaphysical hatred with the political hatred of new-comer Persians invaders, who were seeing to loot / conquer made the court of Goshtasp / Cyrus to easily accept his religion.

- Classical and political Zoroastrianism:

Zarathushtra, in the face of Mitra (the contract / campus), established the divine order of Ashe. The political order converted Mitra's equilibrium / consensus into the hierarchical political order and the divine right, and the Maad land parcel into Heavenly Ferdows. Zarathustra, influenced by Mesopotamian Ethiopia, was the first of its predecessors to regularly and influential, moral / metaphysical and heavenly commands for the development of ground order. The world is a battleground between the forces of good and evil, the manifestation of which is the battle of Ahura and Ahriman. The doctrine of Zarathushtra was intended to establish a ground order, based on Divine order or 'Asha'. Perhaps his divine / metaphysical arrangement was an instrument for defining his hierarchical, political / religious order. No matter what the personal motive of Zarathustra was. History does not have any personal motivation or inheritance. Today, from the angle of political reason to Zarathustra's doctrine, the result is the same. Zarathustra's divine / metaphysical order was a tool for establishing and justifying Zoroaster's and Achaemenid's political / religious hierarchical order. The Achaemenid Empire, based on the doctrine of Zoroastrianism, considered its imperial order as the "divine order" and the sovereignty of "Ashra Ahoori", and called its opponents, insurgents and opposition nations as liars and devils. In other words, Iranian / Zoroastrian rationality (Ahura, Asha, religion, etc.) was an instrument or reproduction of the Persian political order.

In Zoroastrianism, the ground order is the continuation of the cosmic order. "At the time of the devil's disgust, Jermazd creates two worlds, one world of minuses and another material that is complementary. In the world of minivium, Jupiter, and six Aşaspand, and Houman, (right handedness), Shahrivar (Sepangar - Sacred Spirit), Khordad (perfection of salvation), August (immortality), whose earthly signification is six creation material: sky, water, earth, plant, cow and giurmorth, and fire, which is scattered throughout every six material creation. The landmark of Jupiter to man (king or farewell), avalanche to the chariots, May to fire, sep-tandard to earth, June to water, August to plant, Shahrivar is also metal, which is the sky of metal, these two worlds are interconnected, for The confrontation with the devil has been created "(My servant .. quoted from Zener, the same, 36).

The letter of the kings, the earthly symmetry of Ahura, Ahura who is the ruler of all affairs without his will the rotation of the earth and the sky will raze down, droughts and lies spread up, and the opponents of the king are opponents of Ahuramazda and the pure religion of Zarathustra. In Zoroastrianism, such as Christianity, "corrupting Mashī and Mashyane by the Divans is compensated only by Behi (the best) religion of Zarathushtra, and it is held up" (Farkhon Dan, quoted from Zener, the same, 76).

"The Foundation of Behi (the best) religion is a the nobility of the Iranians, its material is moderation, its essence is the order and its fellow-supporter is the monarchy, it brings uu its humanly Fere in harmony with the king who is the supporter and sponser of religion" (Dinkerd, Maden version 202-1392). It is the result of this two elements- the alliance of religion and state – in which all the people hold their feasts, the worl is prospering and the devil is broken down, and salvation ... is due to the fact that the classes (fixed) and the worship of Hurmozd spreads out and virtues are expanding (Dinkerd, Maden version, 203). Mazdayasna resembles the Behi religion to a tree whose branches are obedience, forbidding, good deeds, and ... four branches of which are four social classes ... above all of them, Shahanshah is standing leading us to the other aspect of Behi religion. The most complete example of phi-losophy (Zoroastrian religion, Qaderi) is conforming the religion to the state. Religion and government are both the depndant to each other and the symbol and crown of both of them is the king of the kings. The king of Iran is both the guardian of justice and order, and religion and truth "(Zener, the same, 88)". Along with he unity of religion and state in a single person, "Fareshkerd" will happen, with all the efforts of the Demons (Divan) to separate these two, they will not have the power to resist this unity ... For example, if Jam accepted the Behi religion either or Zarathustra came to the kingdom, the next millennium would emerge. " (Dinkerd, Maden version, 209). The disappearance of the Zoroastrian religion after Islam ... was the final end of the marriage of religion and state in which one could not survive without the other in the Zoroastrian mind; along with the destruction of the great king, the religion disappeared, too, and looking forward for the coming of Suscians to reunite them came to an end" ( Zener, same, 86). Compare this hierarchical and religious order derived from the cos-mic order with the Median / Mithraist order that was based on equality, consistency and hori-zontal order.

Monotheism and creation to reveal the treasure of God and ... does not mean for Zoroaster. God needs the creatures to fight evil "(Zener, 1377: 59). The Zoroastrian religion doctrine is based on the struggle between good and evil. In this religion, human body is an instrument in the service of the spirit and wisdom as an instruments for the advent of Ahoori religion (Zainer, 1377, 22) 2. The wisdom is not an independent existence but an instrument in the service of Ahorain law. For Ahura / Shah, the Shari'a (religious law) is an instrument for justifying its power and denying the legitimacy of the enemy, "Ahura Mazda created the universe as a weapon to break the devil and the man is in the frontline of this battle. At the end of this campaign, The human being has accepted this role of God not be coercion but by discreation ... Man is free, but if he chooses evil, he has chosen a behavior in contrary to his nature because Ahura is his father and he is the Son of God. "(Zener, the same, 26). The man is the instrument of God to fight evil. The man and the material world do not have any value on their own: the man is succeeding the will of God and he is subordinate him to fight evil. Zarathustra categorized the world between goodness and shrewedness " Now the two primal Spirits, who reveal themselves in vision as Twins, are the Better and the Bad, in thought and word and action. And between these two the wise ones chose aright, the foolish not so." (Goths, Yasna, Hot 30, clause 3)." The followers of Daeva (or Devil worshippers) did not choose the right path, because they were in doubt and were deceived. Hence, they did not choose the right path but followed the worst thought, the devil or anger, which is the cause of all evil deeds, so as to destroy the mental life of the people " (Goths, the same, clause 6(.

Psalm 48 recites the victory of the followers of the Aeshe in the eternal world and the material world: "There are two ways in the world, the one who cooheses the good is prosperous that he

who chooses the evil will suffer greatly and be sorry, but he who chooses the medium has got no place in society and it is a hideous action ... Those who selected moderation have no place in the society because they prevent developing an integrated and coordinated society; then they say that they are ruling on the basis of justice ... "(Razi, 1380, 136). According to the paragraph mentioned, there is no place listed between the Blessed and the Cursed. There is no divide and there is no middle ground, Blessed are the order of the Persian Empire and the Cursed are their political opponents. There is no middle ground because it hinders the authoritarian order. This is the same knowledge / power that we discussed in the theoretical framework.

In Zarathustra's view, also later in Achaemenid's empire, people are not able to recognize what is right from what is wrong. Zoroaster brought the human reason down from guiding the human being and made the metaphysical religion rule dominate human reason. " Since deluded by these lures, you are unable to realize the right path clearly and choose the same, therefore, Mazda Ahura appointed me as your teacher, so that both parties of good and evil may live in accord with Asha"(Yasna: Hymn 31 clause 2). It is clear that Zoroastrians should show people the right path and the people themselves are not able to properly distinguish right things from the false ones; however, what does giving power and will to man mean? The background for human will is the goodness and evil of wisdom and when Zoroaster places his law in place of rational goodness and badness, what the will means. Freedom of will in Zoroaster has meaning so that his snakes are the symbol of earthly intellect against the metaphysical law, and the human being identifies the right path from the wrong one with the help of his wisdom. The laws and the predetermined and transferred right by Zarathustra / Shah and the obedience of the people who lack the recognition of the right is not proportional to freedom and will. However, in the Mithra, there is no right before the consent and satisfaction of the people so that someone claim being the representative of the sovereignty over others. When the right exists before consensus and human reason and only Zarathustra / Shah possesses the truth, the opponents of the right must be destroyed with violence. (Refer to the chapter on the plan of the state theory regarding the Zoroastrian holy violence)

Therefore, Zoroaster founded his religion and society based on hierarchy and class structure following the order and cosmic / metaphysical hierarchy and order and the opponents of this metaphysical order are the agents of evil and lies. The class society of Zarathustra (Yasna 32, paragraph 1, Yasna 33 and 46) which is based on the dominance of Shah, saints, and military nobles gives no respect to the folks and the legitimacy of this class structure and

Shah's sainthood rises not from the people's consent but in accordance with the cosmic order and the will of Ahura Mazda in which Zoroaster or king of kings are his representatives. As Ghirshman points out: what the king of Iran asked from the subordinating nations was "living for his sake, working for him, satisfying all his desires and dying in his way "(Ghirshman, quoted in Reza'i, 2005, 315).

Contrary to the Mitra's belief that was based on the equality of individuals, the class structure had no impact on it, and in which the individual's agreement and satisfaction in concluding the contract was more important than the nature and status of the person, Zoroaster's religion was a class and political religion. The principles of Zoroastrian religion are absolute and beyond the scope of the individual's authority and consent and accepted the class structure of the society. Hymn 32: " All of you have to listen to my teachings, O, farmers, warriors and the nobles put into practice my teachings" (Razi, 1380) Yasna Hymn 33: " O, Mazda, I will

establish the religion on this land. I will guard the guard and the warriors, the warriors, and the keepers and the farmers from the wilderness of Davisan ... I will keep the crops out of pests "(Razi, Ibid,168). Here we notice that Zarathustra addresses not equal people or the common ones but the classes of the society. Zoroaster's religion was also in the interest of the slaveholder aristocrats, who saw their interest in uniting all the people and the powerful government. Therefore, "Zoroastrian religion is not the ideology of all the oppressed people. It does not reflect the desires of the most deprived and most oppressed people of that time, ie slaves. The religion of Mazda is not a universal religion, it looks at the non-Aryans with scorn "(Shayan in Dehbashi, 1388: 18).

Zarathustra also believes in compulsion and attaining the political power to expand its religion, "those who have become accustomed to bad and ugly ... must be sparked among them a mighty prince to restrain ugliness and extend peace, and punishes the liars" (Hat 53 Quotes from Razi, 1380: 201). Instead of attending to the general public, it tries to attract the kings and elders, "among the brotherhood community - the Magh-i-Mogh- has a more strong faith, he is Vishtaseb ... good verse for Vishtaseb ... Jamaseb and .... "(Razi, 1380, 187). According to Zoroaster, "good kings should rule so that the land flourishes and the horses abandon" (Razi, the same: 189). After the king's tendency towards his religion, he expresses his optimism in Hot 48 about the victories of the Mazdyasnan (Hot 48, quoted from Razi, the same, 188). It means that it is a political religion in the sense of domination and as an instrument in the service of the power of the kings. In appearance, power and politics are instruments of religious truth, but it is Ahoraian religion and truth that turns into the tool of political power and domination of the Aryans.

The word sacrificed in the language of Zoroastrianism is equated with thought (Gayman, (1378: 56). Faith in the spirit ability, thought, prayer, and ... does not always have a lot of distance with magic (Gayman, the same: 57). Zoroaster condemned the external sacrifice through internalizing it. Zoroaster condemned sacrificing the cow and sacrificed the life of the human being. The Mithraans established their existentially through sacrificing the cow and they exulted in joy, dance and emancipation of the instinct, but Zoroastrian dedicated the instincts and individual life of individuals and their Dionysm's joy for the sake of the general and hollow concepts of good thought and ... The magic of good deeds and good manners that brought man to prosperity in actuality took people's real prosperity out of them. Zarathustra gave responsibility to the man to repel the responsibility out of God. Zoroaster took the art of living from the people via dominating the hollow concepts of goodness, and he destroyed the real prosperity through constructing the imaginary happiness. Zarathustra eradicated external coercion through internalizing it. Zoroastrians slaved the belief in liberty by prioritizing faith. Zoroaster removed the god of destination by internalizing God destroyed and sacrificed human and rights for the sake of the political power of religion.

#### The Zoroastrianism of the Achaemenids in contrast to the Median Mithra

We said Zoroaster lived around 600 to 500 BC. According to Goldener, Zarathustra's time does not exceed six centuries BC (Farshadmehr, 1388: 271), and the peak of his campaign has been in the last years of the Median kingdom and the Median ritual of Mithra has been at the sharp point of his assault. As Henning and Niederberg say whether Zoroaster has been born in the East, or - As Bartholomew says, in the West, both groups agree that the reason for his migration was escape from Mithraists who rejected the Zoroastrian religion. As Purdavood rightly pointed

out that the theory of Zarathustra being Median has gained its previous strength, and Bartholomew, despite the existence of some evidence indicating the eastern be-ing of Zarathushtra, considered him to be Median taking refuge in the East following the formation of a evil image of the Medes and Mitraists. Zarathustra disappointed to spread his religion among the Median Mithraists, he took refuge in the eastern homeland " To what land shall I go to flee, whither to flee? From nobles and from my peers they sever me, nor are the people pleased with me [.....], nor the Liar rulers of the land. How am I to please thee, Mazda Ahura?" ( Yasna 46, clause1) Thus, Zoroaster rebelled against the Median Mithra, then he es-caped and took refuge in the east.

Zarathustra began the struggle and severe cultural propaganda against Medians and their religion after fleeing from the Median Mithra'ians. Henning, Niberger, Gayman, Hintz ... regarded the sharp attack of Zarathustra to be against the ritual of Mitra. Meanwhile, during the time when Zoroaster engaged in religious / cultural propaganda against the Medes and their religion, Cyrus and his missionaries had started a vigorous struggle against the Medes and the Shah of Ajydak. "Cyrus and Zarathustra lived at the same time" (Farshadmehr, 1388, 271). The common enemy of Mede / Mitra has united Zoroastrianism / Kurosh. The unity of religion and state in Iranian political culture, its decency initiated with the Cyrus and Zoroastrian uni-ty, it closed down first for military / Political reason and the second due to ritual / religious reasons.

As Cook points out, Cyrus had already planned to overthrow the yoke of the hideous ruling of the Medes. Therefore, cuniform Mesopotamian sources narrate that Cyrus had established political relations with Babylon so that he feel peace of mind from the west part of his country. "He was simultaneously aware of the north and east, and he could have called on his Prophet in Kashmar where Zarathustra became famous at that time ... Zarathustra also would like (this meeting). Those two probably met in 555 BC ... , Zoroastrianism of Cyrus is proved based on the Pasargad fireplaces "(Hinets, 1386, 93). Cyrus, in military / political terms, and Zoroaster, with cultural / religious propaganda, had already tried to destroy the Medes and Mitra. Zarathustra, who had found a position in the east and had become familiar with western mythology had an accord with Cyrus to spread Zoroaster's religion and Zoroaster gave legitimacy to the actions of Cyrus and asked him for the destruction of Med / Mitra in return. Thus, Cyrus wanted Zoroaster to legitimize his sword in return of expanding his religion; hence, accursing the Medes aimed at destroyings them. By molding the eastern mythology, he enframed Ajidak to the king of Mede, and Kekhsrou and Fereydun to Cyrus.

There are several theories about Zoroastrianism of the Achaemenids, some have accepted the traditional time and considered Goshbash Kiani as the father of Dariush: Zaynar Doshgymman, Oumstad, Der Spiegel, Villandorant and Herri, Cameron and Marianmullah know the Achaemenid era as Zoroasterian after Daroush (Geri in Dehbashi, 2009, 840). Caibar, Boyce, Cameron, Colman, Diakonow, Gelnner, Gershwich, Hertzfeld, Hinels, Kent, Amstet and Wiespeuer consider Achaemenids period as Zoroastrian (Yama Ouchi, 1390, 482) Some believe the Achaemenids had an ancient Aryan religion and they were multi-gods worshippers ... though people gradually accepted the Zoroastrian religion; Benonist, Mehrdad, Bahar, Nijerg, Girshman and Zarrinkoub are among this group. A group also do not regard the first half of

Hachamanids' era as Zoroastrians - Cyrus and Drawhose - but they consider the later kings from Artaxerxes II onward as Zoroastrian, Dunnamayef, Abayef, Jackson and ... are the



followers of this theory (Gray, Dehbash, 1388:840). Mary Boyce, who does not regard a difference between the old Avesta - Gata - and the new Avesta, with the ancient Aryan religion; he considers the Achaemenids as the followers of Zoroastrianism. Others, like Diakonov, regard the Achaemenids as followers of the new Avesta, not Gata (ibid., P. 840). It seems that with the discovery of fireplaces of Cyrus's time and adaptation of myths, the theory of Achaemenids being Zoroastrianism seems to be more acceptable.

The archaeological findings of the Pasargad belonging to Cyrus period and ... Herodotus description about the Persian religion in harmony with Zoroastrianism ... specifies that Zoroastrianism has had the title of the official religion in the great Achaemenid monarchy "(Boyce, 1375, 10-11). There are three scattered fireplaces on the southwest of Pasargada which shows Cyrus having Zoroastrian religion (Boyce, the same, 84). "... Cyrus built his own tomb so that he would sanctify himself and make himself permanent after death contrary to the Zoroastrian tradition that the body should be devoured and his tomb be preserved in a steppe and rocky form that did not touch the soil or the water so as to preserve Zoroastrianism" (ibid: 89). The people of Achaemenid dynasty were Zoroastrian from the time of Cyrus onward, and like other Persians, they accepted this religion under the guidance of the Median majors members (Boyce, 1386, 61). Cyrus had a Zoroastrian religion (Farshadmehr, 1388: 355) There is no doubt that the Achaemenid religion was a part of the Zoroastrian religion (Jung, 135: 1390).

Some scholars questioned Zoroastrianism of the Achaemenids (Darius and Cyrus) saying that there was no mention of Zoroaster in the inscriptions; however, as Moulton correctly pointed out, the Christian kings also removed the name of Jesus the Prophet and directly attributed their victories to God and the Holy Mary (Gamman, 1994: 94). The Abbasid Caliphs also, without mentioning the Prophet of Islam, introduced themselves as representative of Al-lah (the shadow of Allah), and they considered their power as directly from God. Is a reason that they were not Muslims or not believers of the Islam Prophet? "The vacant place of Zarathustra's name in the Achaemenid scriptures can not prove them not to be Zoroastrian, and the Sasanians have not mentioned Zoroaster's name in any of their epithets" (Rajabi, 1380: 43). Can anybody suspect the Sassanian being Zoroastrian only due to this reason that they have not named Zarathustra? In the Assyrian, Babylonian and Elamite inscriptions, which were as the model of Iranian inscriptions, there are also no mention of the name of their Prophets (Boyce, 1375: 174). In rejecting the Zoroastrian being of Achaemenids, some say that Darius has not mentioned the name of Engermino - Ahriman - ... while in the Goths, the word "lie" has been used more than Engremino; besides, in Freervena Yasna, there exists no name of Angerhemini ..." (ibid: 174). We will focus more on the "Achaemenid" relationship with Zoroastrianism and the story of the Kianians in the discussion of the Iranian mythology. It should only be noted here that not mentioning the name of Zoroaster in the Achaemenids was due to absolute tyranny and direct connection between King and God so as to remove mediation of the Zarathustra (Rajabi, ibid, 44-45). The term Zarathustra is a western expression, Zoroastrians called themselves Mazdean and Mazda worshippers. Mazda has had a decisive role, not Zarathustra (Lommel in Rajabi, the same: 46). "The name of Ahura Mazda, the existence of the Divans and the two principles of *arte/ashe*, and the *lie* signals the similarity between the Goths and the Achaemenid inscriptions" (Bahar, 161: 1384.) The difference between ancient Persian and Avesta words does not mean that the Achaemenids had a different religious interpretation of Zoroastrianism (Schwartz, Cambridge, 1387: 820), the contradiction between lies and truth,

and the reliance on Ahuramazda is identical in the Goths and Achaemenid inscriptions (ibid: 47). Zarathustra's message and Zoroastrian Culture spreaded in the west and among the Persians up to the Daroush time (Razi, 1385: 59). Iranian stone scriptures are so strongly believed to be Zoroastrian that it is said that as if they use images or even texts from the Avesta (Jung, 1390: 135). It is reasonable to assume that the majority of Iranian cities and villages were Zoroasterian during Alexander's conquest (Boys, quoted by Rajabi, 1380: 43).

After some Median and non- Zoroastrians – names, we will encounter the names such as Dariush - Aria and Hoomana - meaning someone who supports the good idea, which is a Zoroastrian word and corresponds to a piece of the Goths. Xerxes is also the one who truly reigns ... Artagnes, that is Ardashir all are the Zoroastrian names used in Zoroastrian prayers under the name Ratam and Hawa ... like the fanatic Puritans. The owners of these names were Zoroasterian like Motawakkāl and Mahdi, and ...in Islam that were certainly Muslims. The will of Darius's tomb is entirely based on Zoroasterian goodness and evil. "(Hertzfeld, Bitā, 78-79). The political concepts of the Achaemenid Mythology, such as the Ajayadk and the lies addressed to the Medes, are taken from The Zoroastrian lexicon. Dariush, in the words of Hinets, in persuing the demonization of Mithra, destroyed the Mithraians Mehrabe's and Xerxes razed the Divan's temples, which, according to Hertzfeld, is the same as the temples of Mithrahi.

Today, this word of Herodotus that Persian/Achaemenids did not have the temple and fireplace is not acceptable (Schwartz, the same: 829). "There are no doubts about the existence of the Achaemenid temples" (Danmamayef, 1386, 322). Archeology confirms the existence of the altar in the Achaemenids. "(Cook, the same: 267). "The Achaemenid religious construction in Pasargard shows the profound influence of Zoroastrianism "(Hinets, 1386: 83). "Today, we know at least twenty places in Pars where there were the fireplace at the time of Darius and there has been held a Zoroasterian prayer" (Hinats, Same: 368). Gershwitz also correctly doubted The Benonist theory specifying that there is no names inspired by the Zoroaster cult in Persepolis (Cook, 1383: 275). The concept "Art" in the Achaemenid inscription is the same as "Ashe" in Zarathustra, and the lie of the inscription is identical to its Gats' concept; when it is said that O, Ahuramazda protect the country from the lie, it means from - lawlessness, chaos and ... . Zoroaster also says that the lier prevent the city and the village from development and prosperity, only those who believe in Ashe (good things) are capable of leading (Ratzi, 1380: 130). "We have to believe that the Achaemenids were Zoroastrians from Darius onward but in a particular way ... the differences either arise from the developments of the Goths af-ter Zoroastrians, or Darius adapted Goths with the needs of his kingdom "(Gaiman, 1363: 100101). "The Zoroastrian doctrine by Cyrus and Darius, who proclaimed their belief in the new religion, had a universal effect (Hinats, 1986: 86). "The Achaemenid kings had made the Zoroastrian religion as their own official religion" (Ivanov, 1359: 107).

Another argument in favour of the Zoroastrian being of the Achaemenid kings is that the mere mention of the name of Ahuramazda is not a reason for Zoroastrianism, since Ahu-ramazda is not just the Zoroastrian god, and it existed even before Zoroastrianism, too. If it had existed before Zoroaster, it would have been only Ahura, not Ahuramazda and Zoroaster versus Mitra added Mazda meaning the wise to Ahura. According to Tawadia, if Ahuramaz-da had been worshiped in Iran prior to Zoroaster, why there would not have been sung a Yasht praising him

(Tawadia quoted by Gaiman, 1363: 100). Thus, the Ahuramazda's prayer represents Darius and Xerxes as being Zoroastrian (Ivanov, 107: 1359).

Another argument presented is that the behavior of the Achaemenid kings was not proportional to the Zoroastrian religion. First of all, many of their deeds "like the incest marriage was among the principles of Zoroastrian religion. Congenital marriage is one of the most important beliefs of the Zoroastrian religion ... it was consumed as a kind of piety and worth, and even an effective action against the evil forces "(Cambridge, Gershwij, 784), which the Achaemenid kings also regarded it as holy and it was a commonplace action among them. Secondly, the political behavior which king in which religion was in accordance with the teachings of that religion. Which actions of the Christian kings or the Caliphates of Islam were in accordance with the teachings of Islam or Christianity and their Prophets' traditions. The logic of power is different from the logic of religion; the power imposes its logic to any-one apart from his/her beliefs. Beliefs are utilized only to justify and give legitimacy not as a motivator for action. Thirdly, the political behavior of the Achaemenid's king was completely in line with Zoroasterianism and the Achaemenid's killing and suppression of the Medes was the continuation of "kill with battle ax" and the devil and demon calling of the Medes.

Another argument mentioned in rejecting the Achaemenid Zoroastrianism is that the kings like Kurosh and Dariush mentioned the name of other gods and they were tolerant towards the other religions and their gods in contrast to the Zoroasterianism spirit. In response, it should be said that the tolerance of the Achaemenid kings does not relate to their religious morale and is more related to their political cleverance and foreign policy. The favorable view of Cyrus and Cambyses toward other religions was due to two reasons, one was the benefits of the time-for example, the use of Jews to attack Egypt- and the other the primacy being of those religion which could not compete with the religions of the East (Danmadeyev, the same: 331). The similarity between Zoroastrianism and the Achaemenid religion is so abundant that it can not be concluded that the Zoroastrian religion was the religion of the Achaemenid kings, at least from Darius onward (Skyru in Curtis, 1390: 78). Darius could not have issued a decree to the people not to worship gods like Anahita and Mithra that were known among the people. According to the Benonist, Mithra was in the center of Iran's myths and at it was at the time of Darius that there created the reconciliation between Zoroasterianism and the ancient ritual (Danmamayef, the same: 319). Of course, this compromise was not with the original Mithra, but with the Zoroastrianized Mithra; in fact, the respect for the same Zoroastrianism as I have already said. Besides, many Islamic countries have relation with Israel now or they are tolerant towards other religions and their followers. Thus it is not a reason that they are not Muslims; hence, the tolerance of Achaemenid kings or mentioning the names of the gods of the other religions is just a cause for acquiring legitimacy and justifying their domination over them. Napoleon Bonaparte also praised the Qur'an and the God of Muslims, is it there any reason for his belief in Islam? No, he just did it to gain legitimacy of ruling over them<sup>1</sup>. Religious beliefs of the majority of Iranian rulers had more a propaganda aspect than the inner motive and "Darius' respect for the religion of other peoples should be accounted more in political terms than in religious beliefs" (Hinets, 1386, 477). Darius sacrificed religious rigor for the sake of the calm of the empire ... he knew all people are not Zoroastrians "(Hi-nats, 1386, 370). In the meantime, he tried to remove other religions and impose the religion of Zoroastrianism through apparent tolerance with other religions. Nonetheless, with all his political craftiness, Darius showed no tolerance against the rite of Mithra and the Medes because the basis of Iranian

civilization and religion was developed against the Median civilization and religion. There was no possibility of tolerance in the face of Medes and their rituals. We will later discuss Darius and his actions against Gōmata in detail. Here it is better to indicate that Darius' stricture towards the Medes is not restricted to their religion and rites, but, as he himself pointed out in the inscription of Bisotun, his strictness toward the insurrection of Mede had been immense compared to other insurgents, and he killed at least 34 thousand and captivated 18 thousand (Cooke, 1383: 112). The political hatred of Pars toward the Medes had been under the influence of religious curse of Zoroastrian against Mitra because in the Gats, the infidels have to be destroyed by weapons (Yasna, 18/31) and the one who do harm to infidels in language and thought or action, has acted based on Ahura Mazda's will (Yasna, 2/32). Humbach and Lumel correctly consider the intention of weapons in Yasnah 18 as armaments (Ashtiani, Dehbashi, 1388: 594).

Nowadays it has been confirmed that holy (Divani) temple which Xerxes implied has been related to Mede gods and it has been due to his Zoroastrian beliefs. Hartsfield thinks that dilapidation of goblins by Xerxes is related to goblins of insurgent Med gods. (Ochi, 1390, p478)

As Martin Schwartz says: monotheism has not been the motivation of Xerxes and he hasn't prohibited the worship of other gods, from Cyrus to Xerxes, they were supporting the worship of other gods that had been accorded to their political purpose. They were just destroyed the insurgent temples. According to Fray, Xerxes's purpose has been the goblins of Persia, which were of particular importance for Pers and his policy has definitely been for making Pers more Persian culturally and religiously. Bianchi, Schwartz, and Balser account goblins as the ancient Persian gods like Mitra. The achaemenian kings culturally compromised and if they destroyed a temple it was after a political rebel and because of punishment. The word goblin implies that he has had Zoroastrian motivation. Xerxes believes in the destruction of goblins and ormuzd law. All of the researchers who studied with regard to this subject expressed that the goblin worshippers were not Babylonians or Egyptians but rather they were Persians or Aryans at least, Mitra belongs to the goblins. Of course considering the Mitra as an Aryan is Fray's wrong presupposition as I have said. Demon proscription under king Xerxes derived from juridical books, Deus at Gots, Xerxes has not been an unitarian, in his inscription and classical sources, the king recognized adoration of demons. Among these countries there was a place that were worshipping demons so king Xerxes forbade the religion of Mitra and other gods that were excommunicated by zeoroaster (demons) and destroyed their temple. Hertsfeld's opinion is more rightful that esteemed the tribal gods (insurgent Medes) like Mitra and Anahita as demons. Here we haven't enough opportunity to discuss about the Moghs and at the continuation of the debate we completely discuss about them, that they were not only Mede and Mitra but also Persian and Zeorastrian. But here it should just be indicated that Hertsfeld's theory - as Damadife indicated too - that believed combat against the mentioned gods is combat against the Moghs has been wrong. Hertsfeld's theory about Achemenians and Moghs enmity is not basic. Incidentally the mentioned combat had not been against Moghs but rather had been with proselytize of Zoroasterian Moghs against Mede and Mitra creed and Xerxes arise against goblins through the impact of Moths. The Moths compelled Xerxes to destroy the goblin temples, the very same Moghs that wrote the van-didad book or the anti demon law against Mede and Mitra.

### Making Mitra Zoroasterian/ Persian

The history of Pers and Mede couldn't be written without perception from action and reaction between Mitra and Zoroaster. From the moment that Iranian entered in the arena of history we have two different primary religions, one of them is the worshippers of Mitra that is at the top of the goblins, the other one is Ormazd. Mitra is the creed of equality and Zoroaster is a graded creed. In a period of time between the end of first millennia to 7th century there was two creeds, Mehr and Zoroaster, Zoroaster spreads among dominant classes little by little and also Mehr propagates as the creed of equality and fraternity among most of trade men and farmers 'in public culture Mehr could convert to public god and even people have been taken from Ahura Mazda and have been given to Mehr. Absence of followers' revenue, provision of voluntary expenditure, and obliteration of small Mehrabe are signs that show the Mehr religion was public, although grandees had tendency toward Mehr religion most of the followers were from the poor and the pauper, The problem of fund and Mehrabe expenditures were being provided hardly, the government wasn't helping the Mehr creed. If we take a look at the history of other religions, from Zoroaster to Christian and Islam, always a lot of expenditures have been spent on their temples, because these religions were governmental and aristocratic and unlike these religions the Mehr creed was a public creed and they have held their rituals in the natural caves, Mehr is the creed of adaptation and equality, politicians and holy religion of Zoroaster and Islam that are at the top of the pyramid couldn't be consistent with equality and contract of Mitra. But because from one side Mitra has been propagated among public as the creed of equality and it has been an epidemic creed among Mede, and from the other side the base of Pers territory and culture have been the confiscation of the Mede, so for justification of their legitimation in the territory and policy of the Medes they should define the position of Mitra that was another Zoroaster of Achaemenian to succeed in digesting the Mede and native people in their system and destruction of the motivation of the Mede revolt, and instead of the previous Median Mitra they made a bogus and Zoroastrian Mitra, a Mitra that according to Pordavoud got the Zoroastrian confirmation. We expatiated on the previous Median Mitra\ contract before, now we'll show how the bogus Iranian\ Zoroastrian Mitra has been made.

The Iranian/ Zoroasterian Mitra changed the meaning from equal contract to respectability of lower class to the upper class, it changed the meaning from the loyalty of both sides to the contract of loyalty of lower classes to governors, but why it changed its meaning? As we said previously the society and government of the Medes was based on social contract and depended more on liberals than nobles. It had the capacity of realization, and performing the notion of the original Mitra, in the Mede society any agreement between two persons or groups revealed Mitra from inexistence of abstraction to existence of congregation. After ratification of the treaty between two persons and their agreement, Mitra entered to their debate, just for respecting and assistance about the contract that was based on contentment. Mitra had nothing to do with the goodness or badness of the contract, or if the contract is based on religious principals or morality. "lest breaking the contract neither a contract that you concluded with a mendacious person nor that of a veracious one, both of them are contracts, whether with mendacious or veracious." In this society and culture contentment and agreement of people underlain of every goodness and badness and there wasn't any predefined good and bad based on religion and wisdom principals. But in the Iranian/Achaemenian society that its foundation was based on religious myths and Zoroasterian metaphysical absolute reality and sovereignty's political order was based on hierarchy and obedience of vassal from master

and king, the proving of Mitra as an equal treaty was not possible, because Achamenians needed obedience, so they renewed the Mehr that was the symbol of friendship and agreement but changed its meaning from concordance to obedience, according to Lenses they changed it to obedience and reverence of king and lords, so Mitra was not implied the contract at the ancient Persia, rather according to Hertsfeld it was some-thing like moral obligation that society was based on it, or according to Lentes it was implied piety, that should be supposed in its comprehensive meaning as the divinity reverence, attention to religious rules, and respect or reverence for parents, the king, and others. Because of this, Zoroaster that was Achamenian's governmental religion relegated the obligations of Mira to the Sraosha god. Based on Mitra's absolute influence and that magi couldn't replace Mites with Ormazd for its efficiency. They replaced Mitra with Sraosha that was a superlative and nearest god to Mitra. The meaning of Sraosha was obedience. At Zoroastrianism (or Mazdayasna) the validity of Mitra decreased but, the of Sraosha increased, The duties of Mitra and its distinguished points attributed to the Sraosha, Mitra's de-scription about Sraosha at Mihr Yashtdescribed literally at Tasha 57. Mitra that is a bilateral contact has been rejected and Sraosha that is obedience has been dominated because in the way of achieving Ormazd, obedience is dominant.

Transforming intra-text of Mithra and constructing Zoroastrian Mithra (a model for the construction of the Persian kurd)

The method of Iranian political intellet (both Zoroastrian's religious and Achamenian's political) unlike Semitic/Arabic political intellect is productive except for its destruction and killing, with the metamorphosis of the contradictory matter's real nature, they made it internal and insider because there should be nothing out of intellect's domain, because the nature of the external idea is the source of fear. The primitive man sometimes for the sake of revenge on his relatives murder, accepted the murderer inside his family and in this way his sense of ven-detta satisfied. Nowadays most of western researchers and even Kurd researchers have been accepted the Persianism viewpoint that is based on Iran and Kurd cultural parallelism, incog-nizant of that this viewpoint is not the reflection of reality, but is resulted from the internali-zation of the domination on the Kurd. Urania intellectual according to Foko that has said I anither way " it proctored instead of punishment. The difference between Iran and Arab en-counter with Kurd is the difference between two domination viewpoints, not domination and freedom. Domination of Iran on Kurd is more invisible and based on deliberation and con-sciuousness. The currency of this viewpoint resulted from more domination and internalization of Iranian domination on Kurd . Opposition of the Kurd's matter with Iran has been dis-solved from the viewpoint of Iranian mentality and in one of the elements. We previously tried enough to describe the real Mitra and declearing Zoroaser's hate for it. But then with the metmorphosis of real Mitra, they perfectly create a counterfeit/ Zoroastrian Mitra that for cen-turies distinguished researchers couldn't discover it, just like when they changed the real Kurd and creation of a counterfeit/ Iranian Kurd they made a nice and compliant Zoroasterian Mi-tra with showing the contrary side of Mitra as devil and demon. Just like when they made dissident Kurd as Zahhak and bogie, they made an obedience and submissive Iranian Kurd, that we briefly discuss about Zoroasteration of Mitra at the continuance the is a model for how they create an Iranian Kurd and original aboriginals.

For any researcher it is clear that the ancient content of Yashts is not consistent with principles of Avesta. For the researchers of the culture of nations what is important at holy books are parts that contain mundane contents that frequently have not direct dependency with the whole text of the book, for example sonnets of Solomon as a component of antiquity or the story of Joseph at Egypt, the 12 sura of Quran. At Avesta the part of gods' chant or Yashts include as a kind of disproportionate text. Of course according to Poordavood the Yashts have been gotten the confirmation of Zoroaster, the Yashts have been adapted to the Zoroas-ter. But Yashts, according to Poordavood, have been gotten the confirmation of Zoroaster. Yashts adjusted with Zoroaster. Mihr Yasht doesn't show all of the Mihr evolutions at the culture of Iran, just that part of its character that is consistent with Zoroaster has been re-mained. Colenz who repudiates that Kayanians were historical and accounts the champions are not national Iranian, rather they are common heritage of Indian and Iranian mythology. He accounts that Yashts as preparation of national history that Iranian and Indian mythologi-cal champions have been conveyed to the Iran land at a historical order and has been con-ferred the regnal land. In his belief Yashts are ideological work based on Zoroasterianism that links the ancient mythologies to the dynasties that has been adjusts to national Iranian conscience and reign's goal and the regularizers account Yashts as Achaemenian ideologists.

In the whole of 10th Yasht (or Mihr Yasht) as an ancient Yasht, there are some tips that doesn't leave any doubt which it is ancient and Mitra has been introduced as the biggest god and there's nothing about Ormazd, the word Dami-Datem means it's a creature that this word is a title at Vendidad that has been given to Ormazd. At the preface of 10th Yasht Mitra is the creature of Ormazd that indeed is from the alternations of Zoroaster in the Yasht. The ti-tles of Mitra and Haoma at the recent Avesta are symbols of beings who are totally different with beings that Zoroaster has been excluded. The reformed face of Mitra stated gradually by mobads, that Mitra resorted to Ormazd and asked him to mention it like other gods. Mitra: I'm the guardian of creatures, people don't mention my name. After omitting Mitra and its primary destruction by Zoroastrian/ Achaemenian system, the created Zoroastrian Mitra is try-ing to settle on Zoroastrian system, just like created Iranian Kurd is trying to settle on Iranian system and talked about being Iranian and not being separatist gloriously. They caused disas-ter, ommited it, and made it hateful in a way that it supplicated Zoroastrian acceptance for desertion from seclude. How Ormazd answers Mitra's complaint, as the permission for en-trance or egress into Zoroastrian religion after Zoroaster... Ormazd affirms. The witness of Mitra means penitence for being Mitra and acceptance of Zoroaster religion. After penitence and acceptance of Zoroaster religion, Ormazd gives it a position again for consolation. In the first paragraph of Yasht, Ormazd says " I created Mitra equal to my position from the state of dignity and laudation." Just like when the Achaemenian mentioned the names of Medes as equivalent as the Pers on their epigraphs, researchers and the Kurd themselves normalize it as a common system and fraternity for the Mede and the Pers. At 13 Yasht, Farvadin Yasht, Ormazd says to Zoroaster that I created Mitra as equal as myself. At the 10th Yasht "Mitra for helping us... for prosecuting us... all around the material world is meritorious to be praised." Just like the helping of the Kurd at the protection of Iran boundaries. After getting the confirmation of Mitra as being Zoroastrian, Zoroaster tries to make all of the costumes of Mitra Zoroastrian, too. At 21 paragraph, Zoroaster I reference to Ormazd asks that how a pi-ous person use from the power that has been prepared according to religion rule (Mazdayasna and not Divyasna ). After Zoroaster, Mitra on behalf of Zoroasterians accepted at the group of Zoroastrian gods

necessarily and urgently. The sky changed and depended on accepted Zoroastrian ceremony. Paragraph 49 to 59, the kardag of 12 and 13 are Zoroastrian addenda. Especially the kardag of 13 that shows its (Mitra) slump of power at reformations of Mazda-ism that requested its complaint to Ormazd, just like nowadays that the Kurd requests to show itself as being Iranian.

The ancient gods that interred into Zoroaster creed again had been adapted to Gathas horizon. Mitra that had been returned to Avesta was not the god of gory sacrifice anymore. Haoma was not an agony beverage but rather was a sacred beverage that fermentation not accomplishes in it, but it was just a sap from a sacred plant.

(Zarinkob, 1368: 60). The ancient gods who reentered the Zoroastrianism had been adapted to the Gothic horizons; the Mithras who had returned to Avesta was no longer the God of the bloody sacrifice. Hume was also not an enebriating drink, but a sacred one in which no fermentation took place and it was only a sap of a sacred plant" d(Zarinkoub, 1368: 60). The sacrificial ceremony and drinking potation was removed in the Zarathustra religion, and there appeared Zaer (the pilgrim) - Zor (force) - ... In eulogies, the name of Mitra was deleted and in which Mitra called for it so as to be praised in the same Mazdayasnan's ceremonies (Razi, 1381 > 123). Then, in the Avestan and Pahlavi sources, there is no mention of the cow-killing by Mitra, but he is the supporter of the cow (the same: 132) and killing the cow is changing to sacrifice the cow for the sake of cosmic creation. The ritual of worshipping Mith-ra becomes similar to Zoroastrianism, and it is a ceremony without bloodshed, that is to say, it is cleansed from what was the main reason for Zoroaster's opposition to it. The acceptance of the Hume also has the same status as the acceptance of Mithra, i.e. it was no longer the ene-briating drinking that the Zoroastrianism named as evil, but rather it was a simple symbol of fertility and it had no relation to debauching and it was more like a fire ... "(Gamen, 1378: 71). Besides, Kurd is not the same Kurd who owned this land and culture and government, s/he is not the Mithraian Kurd, but a Zoroastrianized and Islamized one.

After Zoroasterizing Mithra completely, Mehr becomes the guard of all Mazdayasnan just for solacing him ... They must demand Zoeter and the sap of Hom and the visitant – the sacred water- precisely to make Mehr content in their religious ceremony" (Mahrishht quoted from Razi, the same). In the same fashion, they always speak of aboriginal and decent Iranian Kurds.

#### - Mithra

Now that Mehr / Mitra himself has become Zoroastrian, the Demons have been demolished, his ceremonies have been Zoroasterianized and the Ha'meh has been reduced to water and milk, it is time for Mitra followers to become Zoroastrianized like Mithra himself. Para-graph 122, clause 30 is about washing and ablution of Mehrists (the same: 156). Mithraists must wash themselves in order to purify from the filth of evil and to be accepted in the Zoroastrian enclave like the baptism of the Christians in relation to unbelievers. "To do this, the Mehrists needed to wash and bath for three nights and three days and whip thirty thirty lash-es to cleanse themselves from filth, in order to participate in the religious orders of Seta - Eitt - Yinya and Visparto" (the same: 156). In this way, "the power of Mithra returned and praised after Zarathustra's reforms, and ..." (157). Only through demonizing him, he succeeded in finding a



deity position near Zarathustra's successors (Quoqiyya in Koloska, 1385: 49). The same blight that Iran brought over Mithra was also repeated in India; all the duties and attributes of Mitra in Veda are similar to the Mitra in the Avesta, both of which are the embodiment of the brightness and the celestial light (Razi: the same, 162). Ahura in Iran is the successor to Varuna on the side of Mitra (the same: 172). As the Mithra of contract transformed into the Mithra of unity and obedience and the contract Hegmatane to the Achaemenid alliance in Iran; hence, the meaning of the Mithraian contract changed into the meaning of unity since the Varana, like Achaemenid, means joining and uniting (ibid., 173). Later on Indian narrations signify that the epic mythology about Mitra-Varuna has turned into the mystical mythology, the same process that was followed in Iran and Mitra-Ahura, especially Mitra, turned into symbolic ethical and mystical myths and Mehri path crossed over the wisdom kingdom (Khosrawani) passage "(ibid. 187). It all means that Mithra got upside down from an earthly / Dionysus rite so that it transformed into a mystical / spiritual ritual. The symbols of the Mithra remained but the Iranian / Zoroastrian sense was attributed to them. Their examples are seen today among the Izadies, Yarsans, Pirshaliyar and Sufism, whose symbols are Mithraists, but their mentalities are Iranian / mystical. This issue is so significant that it is beyond the scope of the current analysis. Its full analysis is the main subject of the second volume of the present book.

Indeed, following Zarathustra's reforms, Mehr lost its personal character (Wiedigren, (36: 1377) and acquired a mystical nature that is under the Zoroasterian influence, or better to say, the Zoroasterian construction. "Zoroaster's theosophic (illuminated) vision found out that the active light that transcends far above the senses and the usual limit is among the basic features of Zarathustra manifesting itself in the form of the god "( the same, 105). The quiddity/essence - mystical Intuition, a god who does not have authenticity in the Mithra'i society is the Zoroasterian goddess whom they have entered his name in Mehryasht accompanying a clerical fabric or Deona also from the Zoroastrian Society and with a Mazdi Yasnaian description" (ibid :103). The Zoroastrianism enlightened vision, with the plunder of the Yashts transformed its earthly / epic spirit into a heavenly / mystical one. "The materials of the new Yasht is around the prayer and the praise having merely a moral and spiritual aspect with the method and concepts of Yassen and Visparend ... that is different from the old Yiddish ... The materials posed in the Old Yashts are dynamic, athletic, heroic or championship, combat, conflict and there the people's lives are vibrant and active and flourishing "(Razi, 1380: 325). The ancient yashts have the literary and poetic value ... in contrary to New Yashts that are without rhythm and meaning subtlety and also they are lifeless , repetitive and rational weakness ... the dialectal differences of the Gots and yashts is due to the time difference "(Razi, 1380: 325). the old Yasht things are requesting and prompting victory over the enemy, conquest of the countries, abundance of the livestock, the greenness, beauty of the body and the human character, the beautiful horses, wealth, glory, comfort, a blessing for people, beautiful children and... but new Yasht is all praising Ahura Mazda. The materials of the new Yasht are dry and repetitive and they are nothing but a dry and religious description in praise and prayer; they are unlike the Avesta and Yasna's songs not having research not poetic value and they are only the principles of praise and prayer regarding Ahuramazda and Amishaspandan "(Razi, 1380: 330). This difference is the difference between the original Mithraian Yasht and the Zoroastrian-constructed Yasht; the mystical spirit of Zoroastrianism, made the Median earthly epics as spiritual and heavenly. Maybe, the Moghs, who were the collectors and authors of Iranian myths, confiscated the Median epics and gave an Iranian / Mystic form and color to it it were

not a break with Zoroaster, but the logical consequence of Zoroaster. The Shahnameh of Ferdowsi which versified the whole history of Iran in the light of spiritual, mystical / metaphysical spirit is the logical result of the Mogs thinking not the break with it, as Sohrevardi is Ferdowsi's logical consequence.

The meaning of many other concepts have been inverted through changing the Median/Mithraian yashts to Zoroastrian / Persian Yashts in which the researchers have considered them as similar culturally and linguistically regardless of their semantic difference and only based on some common words among the Medes and the Persians. One of these concepts is "Farhoshi" which has preserved its use common Kurdish language even today, and it means joy and happiness. Ferahwashi environment of Yasht is a familiar Mithraian environment (Razi, 1381: 101), which Zoroaster ignored in the Goths altogether (Multon, 2008: 75). The word "Ferehwarti", in which the common name of Ferehwartish is prominent, is ethically neutral and it does not mean discrimination between the goods and the bads. This neutral word could not have played a role in the Zoroastrian dualistic system; thus, Zarathustra put it aside. However, it was re-accepted and received a new meaning. In ancient Persia and India, an ethical/mystical meaning was given to it "(Gayman, 1378: 61). Farhourti or Farhoushi meant "se-lection" in the past, but in Zoroastrianism, it meant "support" and the Ferahwashies were the supporting ghosts (Widgegren, 1377: 43). "Zoroaster's message is a mystical experience and it is an experimental attraction connected to the concepts of the beauty of the innerside and in India and Iran through the concept of Deena Gotha, and Khwarene Gotha "(Newly, 2002: 250).. According to Lumel," Farhoshi had a meaning in the earlier Avesta which in practice is the same with the post-Goths concept of Daena (Lumel, quoted by Nialli, the same). In the same way, the anti-cow Mithra acquired the meaning of cow-phile and cow-protector Mithra in Zoroasterianism which Multon and Christensen correctly pointed out that Wahomenah took the place of Mitra in the Goths (Gamman, 1363: 71). That is the Zoroastrian Mithra, not the original Mithra, but he is Wahomneah under the title of Mitra.

Selection and Neutrality, the attributes of Ferahwashi are two Mithraian concepts. We point out that Mithra is a neutral concept meaning contract contract and there is no defined goodness and badness prior to the contract. The choice and agreement is the base of the right and the law; hence, Ferahwashi meaning the selection is seen in Mithraian lexicon not in Zarathushtrianism. This signals the respect for freedom of will in Mithraism, not in Zarathushtrianism in which the man is the slave of metaphysical truths. Farhoshi means both happiness and joy and also the choice, i.e. the choice of happiness that is significant in the context of the culture of Mitra. The change of meaning from joy and choice to the souls of the dead and the submission to religion in Zarathustra are the slightest changes in the general shift of the Mithra, the terrestrial creator, that is, the creation of the people via the artificial agreement, to the Ahura Mazda, the prior creator of man and the creator of the absolute immutable laws. That is why the terrestrial paradise becomes the celestial Ferdows and the Median horizontal / conventional political order is turned to the political vertical order of the divine right of the Persian kings.

Iranian Symbols versus Median Symbols:

In the previous materials, we stated that Iranian political ration is not only different from and opposing to Medes from the political/ social, governmental theory and religious / cultural viewpoint, but also it is contradictory to the Medes and it was developed for its negatiion. In the following, to provide more evidence of the symbols and totems and later the Iranian myths for our hypotheseis. Median civilization is very poor in terms of ancient discoveries; however, its contrasts even in these few cases with ancient Iranian traces that are the symbols of their civilization is quite evident: the lion vs. the cow, the snake in contrast to the eagle and .... We have already said that the lion and the snake represent the land, human instinct and intellect. The cow and the eagle are the symbol of the sky and the spiritual or intellectual wis-dom and the Sharia law.

Median / Kurdish symbols: the lion and the snake

Median civilization is very poor in terms of discovering ancient works and we should still continue to look for new archaeological discoveries. Nevertheless, with all the archaeological poverty at least in the discoveries that have been made, the nature of Median civilization in these works and its opposition to Iranian civilization is quite clear. The images of "AhrimanDivan (demons)", half-humans, half-animals, rams and winged lions, the gods with the head of the lion and half-human devils, which exist in Median and Hurian religion, these images are the symbol of the Divans in the map of the Achaemenid kings and later in Iran, too . (Diakonov, Cambridge, 1387: 168. Bahar, 1384: 147. Shayan, Dehbashi, 1388: 14. Rezaei, 1384: 203). It all means that in ancient works, the persistence of Iranian / Zoroastrianism hatred of the Mede / Mitra is also revealed, and the Median gods which were introduced as the devil and evi in Zarathustra and Vandidad, they are also depicted in the role of demons and satans in the ancient works and the symbols of the Achaemenid/ Zoroastrians. Unlike the Zoroastrians, the Medes" had the custom of burying the dead; on the Sialk Hill, which is be-lieved to be a Median graveyard, there is two hundred graves" (Boyce, the same, 43). The eastern Zoroastrians exposed the corpus on the open air, and this was one of the reasons be-hind the resistance of the Western Iranians – the Medes against Zoroaster" (ibid .: 44). The contradiction of the Medes and the Persians is also realized in the graveyards.

-The Lion:

Unlike most of the symbols and the capitals of the Persepolis, which are in the form of the cow, one of the few remaining traces of the Medes is stony lion (Grishnmann, quoted from Ziapor, 121). In the beliefs of the Medes, gods are seen in the strange forms: the gods with the head of the lion or the half-man demons (Diakonov, Cambridge, Ghaderi, 2008, 168. Shayan, Dehbashi, 2009, 14). Further, the Median weapons and the axes are shown in the form of the lion head (Girshman, Ajand, 1376, 25). In the narration of Ethiyus and Dion, a minstrel called Angaress praised Cyrus at Astyag court (Zarin Kub, 1368, 105), a lion had a boar (cow) on its claws and left it ...The boar killed the lion ... Astyagh realized that the boar was Cyrus and ... "(Shahbazi, 1350, 86). Ajayadkak / After his defeat from Cyrus and being abandonned in the desert, the dead body of Ajidehak was found withoutbeing damaged in the desert because the lions guarded it (Katsizas, Futius, Khalili, 1379). The archaeological find-ings of Hamedan show a bronze vessel in a lion head and two golden cups with a winged head (Yamavakhi, 1390: 358). In the art of the Medes, in arms and arrows, a lion or a lion head is clealy utilized in decorating very

excellent arrows; placing the sword in the open claws of a lion signaled that the weapon gains the high strength of the most powerful predators; these weapons with the head of the lion gnashes his teeth at its blade dents behind which there is the image of a lime ... inside the hats used by the Medes "(Gershman, 1376: 25-26). The golden cup that belongs to the Medes period ... its framework has the strands of three lions .. the heads of the them are highlighted "(same, P. 38)

#### - The snake:

The archaeological findings of Herzfeld indicate worshipping the snake in the Mede. The snake was totem of some local Median tribes, and the Medes have been introduced as the sons of the snake in the ancient texts (Aliyev, 2009, 456). in Mede

"Before the arrival of the Aryans, the worshipping of the snake was commonplace" (Herzfeld, hekmat, 21). Medes worshiped the snake-like gods (Alif, the same, 115). Zakhak, the snake on the shoulder and the three head and six muzzle dragon, and ... the themes of the Avesta are full of the stories of the Iranian battles with the Medes. "(Aliyev, the same, 172). Unlike the other cultures, the snake has a benevolent role in Kurdish culture (Nikitin, 1998, p.535). Therefore, the Medes were well-known as snake-haired Medosa in the Greek culture and as Ajayidhek in Iranian culture. Today, many places in Kurdistan still have Mar (snake) suffixes. The temple of the Mar (snake) in Azerbaijan, which is the remainder of the Median era. Mari-van also means the snake veranda.

#### - Ancient Achaemenid / Persian Symbols:

Not only religion, state, territory and Persian culture are defined and confiscated against the material, ancient symbols and memories, and even Persian language, have veins of antimateriality.

#### - Pasargadae and Inscription of Bisotun:

This point that Why Cyrus declared the establishment of his dynasty in the relatively small Pasargad valley and also he did not choose a wide plain near the Core River, we should refer to Strabon: "The Persians defeated the Medes in Pasargad and Cyrus transformed Pasargad into a memorial site for that historic memory" (Strohnach, Cambridge, 1064: 1387). Niclaus Damasci and the Polyanus and Ketsizas say that the Cyrus build Pasargad in the same place so as to be the victorious demonstration on the king of Mede (Shahbazi, 126), (Strabon: Book 15 chapter 3, clause 8). Cyrus praised the Pasargada highly since it was in this place that he had made the last battle in which he defeated the Median Ishtovigo ... and it put the Asiatic empire in his hand; to survive the memory of this event, Cyrus founded Pasargad palace "(Bryan, 1372: 1380). Pasargadus is the victory place on Median Astyagh; even after the construction of the Persepolis in the hands of Darius, Pasargadae remained as the religious center and the coronation site of the Achaemenid kings (Yamawaki, the same: 368).

Pasargadae is the main Achaemenid palace in Fars, and its name is derived from Pars, the name of the tribe of Cyrus. Pasargadae was personally and politically important for him - Cyrus - It was important even after building the Persepolis, Pasargadae remained as an important criterion for the legitimacy of the government, as well as a ceremonial center for crownings (Garsoet,

the same, 101). Thus, Pasargadae is the capital and the symbol of the Achaemenid monarchy, in honor of the triumph over the Medes, and more importantly, it is rooted in the word "Pars", connoting an emphasis on the Persian ethnic ancestry, which legitimizes the origin of the tribal (ethnic, Qaderi) origin and the past of Achaemenid of Cyrus (Garethwit, the same, 101). The Achaemenids emphasized on the Persian word more than the Aryans, and they referred to their linkage to Persia in contrast to the Medes "(Wissoffer, 1377, 13).

It was not only Pasargadae built in honor of the victory over the Medes, but the Persepolis, in honor of Darius's victory over Median Geumata and the inscription of Bisotun was also escribed in honor of the triumph over the Median Feravertish. J Stein believes that the entire inscription of Bisotun is related to the revolt of the Median against the Iranians (Osten, 1956, 69). The Bisotun inscription is the complete description of Feravertish execution and 18,000 people of the Medes (Danmamayef, 295: 1386). Dariush carved Bisotun in the place where he began his victorious move by killing Geumata (Wiesenhof, 1389: 21). Darius wanted to protect the inscription and to inform the others from its content introducing the epistle as a historical source that must be remembered throughout the history (ibid, 22). Indeed, after victory over Ferawartish uprising in the same place, Darius carved the inscription as a memorial of his victory over the Medes to preserve its memory and to perpetually humiliate them.

#### -Persian language

The Persian language, in its essence, also carries the memory of the victory of Pars on Mede. "The beginning of the Persian language in its written form is the inscription of Bisotun (Kent, 1953, 43). "According to Walter Hinets's narrative, after his victory over Ferawartish and for the sake of this memory, Daruis carved his narration of this victory over the Medes in the inscription of Bishtun, first, in the Elamite and Babylon, then he wondered why not to inscribe the memory of the victory in the ruler's language. Therefore, the existentialist philosophy of the Persian language in its written form basically stands against the Medean rebellion and it reminds us of the memory of Pars's victory over the Medes. The entire ancient Persian language, which begins with the inscription of Bisotun, is 350 to 400 words, spoken around Darius's divine legitimacy and the superiority of the Pars people and the destruction of the Medes. Can a language that was basically written in contrast to the Medes and in honor of triumphing over the Medes and its words convey the meaning of the victory of the Pars on Mede be the language of the Kurds or current Medes?

"Having written the inscription in two languages of Elamite and Akkadi, Daroush was ashamed of not having a writing system himself ... he ordered his Elamites and Aramian secretaries to invent an Iranian chirography ... The secretaries adopted some signs among the elements of all the chirographies of the cuneiform, vertical and horizontal writings and merged them with a alphabetic writing system of Aramid ... meaning the Persian language was a mixture of two writing systems and it arose overnight. It was developed without natural evolution ... "(Hints, 1386, 40 - 41) The ancient Persian chirography stayed only in the chest of rocks and columns of palaces, even it was rarely written on a clay tablets and stone seals " (the same: 4445). Two clay Elamite tablets in Persepolis show that how 16 people including noblemen children, have been compelled to learn ancient Persian by force and at a great cost and reward, so that this

chirography not to be forgotten"(ibid: 45-47). Due to the same costs and military and administrative strength, Persian language was imposed on the other ethnicities. It all means that Persian language emerged simultaneously along with strengthening the Persians and their Empire. Persian language was forgotten with the Arab invasion and the collapse of the Persian Empire and the Persians / Iranians themselves wrote in Arabic. Along with the revival of the Persian power in eastern Iran, the Iranian myths of the royalism and the bearer of those myths, the Persian language, were revived. The scribes of the power of the Persian King, Darius, turned into the devotees and poets of the court of the Samanids, and it was on the order of the kings that Daghghi and afterwards Ferdawsi wrote the Shahnameh, which was the same Sassanid godletter. As the inscriptions of Bisotun were engraved through Darius's order and threatening the scribes; the reason for the birth of the Persian language was the political power, the power that was proud of defeating the Medes/Kurds. For this reason, he inscribed the Bisotun inscription on the Median soil to demonstrate his power and triumph over them. Therefore, as we said like the word "Iran land" and as the Persian language developed by Darius to preserve the memory of Pars's victory over the Medes, Iranshahri thought - the metaphysical legitimacy culture - was also constructed after defeating the Medes by Cyrus and defeating Gaumata and Frhaurtis by Darius to gain legitimacy. After another defeat of the Median rebellion, the Mazdak rebellion, it was codified by the Sassanid in the form of God's letter. Similar to the Persian language, the original compilation of Iranshahri thought - reviving in the Islamic era - is in the inscription of Bisotun which is Darius's narrative of his victory over the Medes, and he repeated the name of Ahura Mazda 69 times as his patron, and the Medes 36 times as Lies, evil, and so on. After the defeat of Gaumata and the Farahtysh Revolution, who sought to revive Median glory, Darius understood the danger of the Medes who would never get subjected to violence; for this reason, he gave Zoroastrianism and mythology a political ideological aspect and consolidated Iran's rationality in connection with Persian power opposing the Medes that I will deal with it in the next chapter.

-The cow:

Most of Pasargard and Persepolis arches and images are decorated in the shape of a cow's head; on the main gate of the Pasargadae there are two winged male bulls (Yamavacchi, 1390, 376). Winged male cows with human heads were the guards of the Assyrian palaces inspiring the Iranian artists (Razi, 1382: 242.) At the entrance view of the western and outer Gate of Nations is the winged cow's body with the human head who has undoubtedly been the guardian of the throne (Pourida, Cambridge, 45). The role of guardian angel at Sargen Palace is the same with the guardian angel of Cyrus. Examples of the image of the guardian cows can be seen in the Pasargad in which there can be observed the image of the mythological cow wearing cloaks" (Malvan, 467). The capitals of Persepolis are mainly in the shape of the head of a cow. The sun and the eagle, which had become the Achaemenid banner, was the manifestation of their monarchy and power ... Another image is the battle of cow and lion... lacerating the cow at the hand of Mehr ... maybe the lion is the symbol of death and cow is the symbol of life ... later Mehr became the devil in cowkilling, and this lion symbolizes Mehr "(Spring, (198 - 180: 1384)

Since the lion is the symbol of Mithra and, along with the snake are the totems of the Medes, the Achaemenid kings have always been depicted hunting the lion, a symbol of devil and evil.

"In Persepolis, Dariush is engaged in hunting lion - among the traditional themes of Assyria - and he is standing in chariot with archery targeting a lion that is roaring and another lion is dying under the horse hooves" (Bois, 152). One of the other symbols of Persepolis is the king lifting a lion with one hand (the same: 156); in fact, "The most beautiful crystalline icon( seal) of Darius I is showing him while hunting in a palm grove under the protection of Ahura Mazda," (Cook ,. (132: 1383.) The lion hunting scene is also depicted 26 times in Persepolis under this theme: "An elderly bull is standing on its legs and it has turned its head back to fight with a lion that wants to tear the shoulders of the cow with its claws. Since the bull is the symbol of goodness and beifits in Zoroastrianism, some say that it demonstrates the battle of Ahura and Ahriman, which is the same goodness and evil. The lion is a sign of impure forces ... with the justification that the bull around the court of the Persepolis is the symbol of the powers, for instance over the head of the columns or on the other side of the corona ... "(Bois, 1375: 156). The lion which one of the animals crated by Devil and it is demon-like is not a symbol of goodness in the Zoroastrianism" (the same as: 157). In the form of the heroic king (Shah), Darius has inserted his dagger on the body of a single horned lion" (Hinets, 1386, 218-219). The Pasargadae Palace building has two images illustrating Cyrus's interest in the construction and sculpture of Mezopotamia... In the images on the Assyrian facade...there is a warrior seen aagainst a devil's lion with an eagle's foot in the northwest door and there is cow-man in the south-east ... Pasargad depictions are more similar to the Assyrian model of the time of Assyrian Binipial" (Stronchus, Cambridge, 1052)." (1052-1053). In the ceremonies of Persepolis ... the crowning again ... the duty of the king was to defeat the Divan (demons), like the battle of God with the evil, that this evil creature was physically exhibited in the body shape of lion, the plmage-filled body and its tail like the snake ... " (Bahar, 1384: 183). The lion near Mitraism was the epitome of being earthly (Mitra), and one of the images of Persepolis is the battle of lion with the cow, which is attributed to the battle with Ahriman in the Zoroastrian religion (ibid: 602). In the religion of Mania, the lion is also the symbol of evil (the same, 602).

#### - The eagle:

"In the national and religious narratives of the Iranians, Fereh-Shahi (king's glory) is related to a bird in the eagle family" (Shahbazi, 1350: 34). The symbol of the Achaemenids and the kings of Iran was the Eagle or the Shaheen (falcon or hawk) (Cook, 1383: 265). The Achae-menid Totem was a wide-winged eagle. Moghan, respecting the Achaemenids, kept their ea-gleshaped flag in the form of Foruhar well-known as Ahura Mazda" (Razi, 1385: 64-65). It is also stated in the myths that the Achaemenid's ancestor, Achaemenid, was raised by an eagle (Cook, 1383: 282). "An eagle feeds Achamenid ... The relationship of the eagle to the royal power of Pars is often confirmed "(Bryan, 1380: 169). The lower part of the Ahura or Ferah's body is always in the shape of an Eagle (Shahbazi, 1350: 341). Achaemenid has not only been trained by an eagle, but also, according to Moses Khorani, it hascasted its shadows on Ar-deshir (Neldak, 1537, 18).

Therefore, the ancient and iconic Iranian works, which are manifestations of their culture and religion, have been created in the confrontation and negation of the Median symbolic works, and if there are any exceptions, they are due to the creativity of the artists of other countries. Because the Iranians themselves did not know how to sculpture, which Cyrus had also neglected it (Bois, 94) because in none of the Elamite tablets of Persepolis, there have come no

name of the Iranian gods called as Demons and ... in the Zoroastrian cult (Boyce, the same: 207). There is no conclusive evidence of the true mention of the title of God of Mehr in the plates of takht-e Jamshid (Cook, 1383: 266). If there is an inscription in the Persepolis influenced by Mitra, it is related to the army and the administrative code, not the religious one (Yamavakhi, 588: 1390).

- Medes in Iranian mythology: Ahriman, Ajaydak, Turanian

We stated in the previous materials that the Medes and their Mithratian beliefs have been either "non" or indeed "Iniranian (anti-Iranian)", both politically / socially and in the theory of government and religion, and ancient symbols. In this section, we will examine the Iranian / Persian mythology to test the anti-Iranian-being of the Kurds / Medes in Iran's mythology. "The other" of the Iranians' myths starts with Ahriman (Devil) and Dave (Demon), which we have already examined, and ends with the Ajaydak and the Turanian. Our hypothesis in this section is that the true examples of the Turanians and the Ajydahak are the same Medes, as is the case with Persians Fereydoun and Kaykhosrowo. The difference of this section with the previous sections is that we do not have the necessary fact, documents and evidences to reconstruct the Median/Kurdish myths. We do not know how much Iranian mythology owes to the confiscation of the Median myths. The information available does not allow us to reconstruct the Median myths, whether it is at all mythological and confiscated, or not? This fact that Yashts, which is the main source of mythology and even the Shahnameh, is Median / Mithraist in origin and it has been confiscated; nonetheless, we do not have the original Yashts at hand to discover the Median being core of Iran's mythological culture. However, this problem can not prevent us from testing our hypothesis. There are sufficient facts to reconstruct this case that "non" or "the other" or "Aniran" of Iranian myths are Medes/Kurds.

Myths in ancient times have played the same role as ideologies have played today in the community. "Iranian myths are not merely unrealistic narratives or beautiful poetry and ... but they are the mainstream ideology of Iranians and their reception of human, society and God" (Heinels, 1385: 26). The Iranians perceive their history in the light of their myths (ibid, 170). "If we want to know the history of a country, we must refer to the mythology of that nation. These are the myths of a nation which build the history of that nation, the history does not build the myths. "This statement of Schelling is true more about Iranians because"these people (Iranians) have always been interested in supernatural and metaphysical affairs. This problem is rooted in the depths of the national characteristics of the Iranians and it has caused numerous problems during the history. Their religious and philosophical system shows that they eradicate any causation and historical account; the narrative of history becomes a myth and story ... However, the same legend has turned into a historical source (Hertzfeld, Hekmat, Bita, 42). Thus, the myths of Iran show the historical creatures and ancient Iranian people and the hostility between the Iranian and the old natives (ibid., 43). The intrinsic genius of Iran, that we pay special attention to, is transforming a historical event through colonial power into mythical happening, and the historical characters and events are arranged in myths (Niolli, 1381: 23). Thus, it is necessary to extract Iran's history out of its mythology since Iranians attended more to religion and mythology than history (Frye: 1344, 8).



Chapter 33 of the Iranian version of Bendhash speaks of the bothers that have occurred to Iranshahr every millennium. "The first millennium began with the assault of Ahriman on the Kyumurts, the cow and the Mashi and the Meshina ... The second millennium initiated with the Ajidak attack on Jamshid up to the victory of Fereydoon... The third millennium started with the Afrasiab invasion and the killing of Nozar, who repulsed Manuchehr and plundered Iranshahr so that Kikhosro overcame Afrasiab and Zarathustra emerged". We have already stated that the denotations of the evil and demon are the Medes and the Mithraists ritual. Further, it will be argued that the denotations of Zahak and Turanian Afrasyab are also the Medes and the main enemy of Iranians and the meanings of the harms relates to the same Median/Kurds and Mithraism rite.

#### - The Philosophy of Creation: Ahura Mazda and Ahriman

" Thereupon, Ohrmazd spoke to the Evil Spirit: "[I project] the time fixed for the contest in the mingled state, to nine thousand years;" for, He knew that He would render the Evil Spirit useless, by this fixation of time, Ahura Mazda's three thousand years of Ahura Mazda's work... three thousand years of merging ..." (Banhash based on Bahar, 1376: 34). Ohrmazd offered the reconciliation, but Ahriman did not accept ... The first three thousand years initiate with the prayer of Ahou-Nour the most important Zoroastrian prayer ... When the Evil Spirit saw he has lost, he fell back into darkness having become stupefied [and uncon-scious]"(Zener, 1377: 36). In the era of the devil's informability, Ohrmazd created two worlds; one is the world of Minuses and the other material world, which complement each other. There are Ohrmazd and the six Auschwandas in the Minui world including: "Vehoman or Ordibehesht which means the truth, Shahrivar: Sepangar: the sacred wisdom, Khordad, the perfection of salvation, Mordad – the immortality and ... Six material creation includes: the sky, the water, the earth, the tree, the cow, Kiomars, and the fire, which is widespread throughout all six material creatures. Ohrmazd for human, Vohuman for the livestock, Ordibehsht the fire, Spandarmaz the earth, Hordad the water, Mordad the plant, Shahrivar also the metal, which the matter of the sky is metal. These two worlds are interconnected and came into being to confront the devil (ibid: 36).

With the knowledge of his fateful defeat from the pious man, Ahriman (Evil Spirit) lay in stupor for three thousand years, until his daughter Jahi solaced and motivated him ... because a snake descended from the sky to the earth to the Farwardin month" (the same: 85). He put Kharfastaran to the ground, the snake, the dragon and the scorpion (the same: 87). The devil spirit himself came on the earth like a snake and it filled the earth with snakes, dragons and scorpions. Then "Ahriman aroused his armies against Ahuramazda and his creatures, the holy cow and the Kiyomarts. Akoman, the evil thought, is the first Kamale the Dew (demon) that is the enemy of Bahman Amshaspand .... Andra or Indira the enemy of Ordibehesht ... Savol the enemy of Shahrivar ... Nagehis the enemy of Sepandarmazd. Most of this Divan appeared for the first time in Vendidad ... Traumad means the contemptor of the thought that the feature of Nagehis meaning unclear and he is the enemy of Sepandamez" (Ibid: 96). We stated that the Vendidad demons refer to the Median concepts and symbols, just as the devil is the same as Mithra. It is the narration of the Zoroastrianism that has given priority to Ahura and the cosmic order in which the Evil Spirit has made an assault while the origin of order was the evil Spirit attacked by Ahura and his troops. The mission of Mithra was cowkilling and Zoroaster constructed Ahura Mazda through nicknaming him as Ahriman (Devil). Zoroaster and Ahura

assaulted the Mitra's order. Zoroaster's angels attacked Mitra's demons, not vice versa. Mitra was alongside the snake, the lion, the scallop, and the cow-killing contrasting Mithra as the symbol of the devil, the holy cow and the eagle as the symbols of Zoroaster.

Bahman stood against Akuman the thought. Akoman, the attribute of Mitra, which is Akowan the demon in Shahnameh, is a symbol of human thought or reason, which the snake is also a symbol of knowledge in the mythology. Zarathustra added the word "bad" to it and called it the bad thought, in contrast to it, he added the attribute of mazda meaning knowledge of Ahura Mazda; thus, he constructed contradiction of the evil thought and the good idea among which the good thought is Ahura Mazda's orders. In the same manner, after Mithra there is not the conflict of two thoughts but the battle of thought with Sharia or divine law. Since there is just one thought, Bahman is the symbol of truth, they are the religious orders that are anti-thoughts; nevertheless, they diverted the line of the history via the religious hegemony of history calling it the thought and Akvan. Truth is an ethical concept having no meaning in thought. It indicates that belief replaced thought; the requisites of belief is nothing but dogmatism and neglect. The meaning of Shahrivar is also holy reason. Reason does not involve sacred and non-sacred. Therefore, the holy reason is the divine knowledge in contrast to human thought. The other angels, Khordad and Mordad, which mean immortality and salvation, connote religious concepts against the earth and the body of Mitra.

Therefore, both the Evil Spirit (Ahriman) and all of the demons in contrast to which Ahura Mazda created the whole of Amshazpandan, Zoroaster and the Goodness are related to the Medes and their Mithraian religion.

#### The Man and the woman:

Along with the holy cow, the first creation of Ahura Mazda is Kiyomars who is a man. Perhaps even, he has created Kiyomarth in contrast to Jahi, the evil. Because the first creation of Ahura Mazda is a man, Kiyomars, but the first creation of Ahriman / Mitra is Jahi, a woman.

Mitra is devoid of gender and as Powell Theme has illuminated he is neutral. The fact that Mitra is also likened to Medusa the woman that killed Persius, the man, is not a reason for Mitra being a woman or female. Nonetheless, the metaphysical ration of Zarathustra is masculine and the woman similar to the evil spirit is the other molded form. In this myth, the first creation of Ahriman / Mitra is a woman named Jahi. It is not clear to us what the word "Jahi" originated from. Jahi rhymes with the word "Jhani" meaning woman in Horami Kurdish dialect. Thus, Ahura's emphasis on the man has been a response to the importance of women in Mithraism. Since woman has a significant role in Pythagoras description of the Mithrahi ritual and the woman in Mithraian dance similar to the Kurds' Halperke today has had an important role a both realistically and symbolically. Peerica, as a sacred Mithraic symbol, was also a female goddess who is described in Vindhid as a demon that takes away men's consciousness.

Archaeologists have also found images of Zahak in the form of a woman who has two snakes in the hands. The Daiakku is also registered in the Assyrian sources as consisting of two parts of the Dai and Akku, the first part of which is probably the echo of the pronunciation of the Dai (mother) in Kurdish language, and AK is also the epithet of Mitra meaning "solid and stubborn" which later acquired a negative connotation appearing in the form of the Aquandiev meaning steady mother or a tough mother in Iran culture. Due to the actual form of Diaco, as well as the

nickname of Mitra as AK, Diaco means a mother who is committed to enforcing the law steadily and strongly as Mitra is also stubborn in establishing the rule of law and he rewards and punishes. Therefore, it is possible to consider the fact that Diako, along with Zahak, the Median kings, have been the women, and the transition from the Mede to the Pars, has been the transition from materiarchy or equality of men and women to patriarchy. Still, the legend of the Shahrians (the serpents kings) portrayed as a woman can be a reflection of the Shah of the Medes among the Kurds (RJJ, Bazan, Saiifikaran, 2016). On the one hand, the Medes were introduced as the snake in many narratives like Mosa Khorni, and also this fact that the kings of the Medes were introduced as the King of Mars (snakes) and on the other hand, the snake has been the Totem of the Medes and the symbol and the legitimacy of the earth; therefore, it is not unlikely that the Shahmaran who has turned into a common name today and it is in the image of a woman is an echo of the Medis kings that have been the women.

Jehi is the name of the daughter of the devil that means the prostitute who was deceiver of men and according to the Zoroastrian mythology the women were created from him ... " (the same: 89). In the Zoroastrian cult, "The wicked Jahi, the corrupt woman slept with Ahriman and seduced the honest man Kiumars; (thus), they consider the sexual desire of man as the cause of devil existence in the world (Henels, 1385, 116). Jahi is the embodiment of lechery (reprobation) and femininity, the illustration of womanly improbity (Bahar, the same, 83). In the Zoroastrian religion, the woman is the symbol of nature, instincts and carnality, she is the depiction of indecency and has no position in Zoroastrian religion so that Ahura Mazda says in Bandhashn, "Although the women give birth to the men, they would not have been created women if there existed another container ..." (ibid, 116). Therefore, the female existential philosophy in Zoroastrian religion is a tool for giving birth to the men inevitably, because there was no other way and reason for the woman to be born. Hormazd to the woman: "I created you from the other side of Jahi the devil, you have opening near the asshole that makes mat-ing with you sweeter than the sweetest stew; I plead your help because the man is born from you but you are the cause of my, Hormazd, harassment. If we found something else to make man out of it, I would never have created you, because your callet race is from Jahi "(Zener, 1377: 46). Jahi is the first woman, as Kiumars is the first man. It seems that "Jahi was created b, but he y Hormazd but she escaped to the devil and became his wife ... menstruation ... in-fection ...made the man septic... but the victory of the Evil is temporary since the woman re-mains obedient forever to the man" (the same: 46-47). The triumph of Kiumars / Zoroastrians on Jahyi and Mitra / Ahriman is the victory of patriarchy over women. The women played an active role in the Mitraism / Median, not the matriarchy but equal to the men. However, with the advent of the metaphysical and rough ration of Zoroaster/Pars, the man was preferred over the woman and equality of men and women would vanish. Equality and freedom of women in Zarathustraian has been portrayed as the woman's abusive and corrupt act whose solution is the absolute obedience of woman to man, which the Zoroasterianism and Islam are its pioneers.

What is the secret of hatred toward the woman in the Zoroastrian religion and Ahuramazda's hostility towards her? The woman is the symbol of nature and wisdom. She is the symbol of pleasure and lust, and the earth, the natural intellect that selects between the right and the wrong and does not need the guidance of the gods. The woman is like a quicksilver who is full of bodily instincts and does not obey the framework of supernatural morality. Sexual desire is multiplied in all the organs of the woman, and the woman is the rebel of biological freedom

against religious and moral standards. Eve guided Adam to eating the fruit of lust and knowledge, which symbolizes her misguidance, lust and corruption. Thus, Zoroaster's emphasis on the man shows the importance of women in the Mitra religion. Along with the snake, Jahi attacks the creators of Ahura Mazda. Also in the Jewish religion, the snake and woman (Eve) mislead people and rebel against the gods. God told Adam and Eve not to eat that special fruit in case they die. However, having seduced the Eve, the serpent made them understand that they would not die, they just became good and bad like the mystic gods. Finally, having eaten the fruit of life and having feared that humans would stay as eternal like the gods, the gods drove them out of heaven (the Torah quoting Maskoob, the introduction to the legend of Tiay Sophocles).

With the victory of Ahura Mazda over Ahriman / Mitra, and the Iranians over the Medes/Kurds, the religious / metaphysical wisdom prevailed over terrestrial / human intellect. "Goshan Serood Kherad" triumphed over "Asen Kherad". "Asen Kherad" means intrinsic wisdom, from the root of the woman (Jen) meaning giving birth, the rationale with which the human being is born stands against the "Goshan Serood Kherad" which is the learned rationale" (bahar: the same, 96-97). The sin of Eve, Mashi and Meshaneh ... has been that they have taken their own instinctive wisdom, or Asen Kherad, as the criterion of life, and they have not given up to the wisdom of the gods, which are their own commands and law. "After the creation of Mashi and Mashiana ... Ormazd said, the spirit was created first, and then the body ... the body was created for the soul and as the soul's instrument to make it work ... Ormazd to Mashi and mashiane ... you are the best creatures regarding intellect and under the guidance of wisdom preach and spread the principle of religion ... "Then Mashi and Mashyane, according to their own intellect in realizing goodness and badness, want to eat meat. In The religion of Zoroastrianism, it is stated "they got astrayed that given the seduction of the Di-van and made the sacrifice ... grilled the meat in the fire ..." (Safa, 1384, 175). It all means that human and earthly intellect is interpreted as the demon. It has been the secret behind calling the Kurds as the demons and devils throughout the history. It has been the secret behind the separation of reason from deification, heaven from the earth, Logus from Aroos, the beginning point of which is the domination of pars on Kurdish partisan and the religion over freedom. It was in this era in which the abominability of Kurds monophylem persisted in the rule of the religious truth "periodic phase", and the Kurds became known as Zakhak the on shoulder serpent, Ahriman, and Medusya the snake-haired and the irrationalc Gutayans. Human intellect or eroticism, against which they developed heavenly logos.

We said that the woman and the snake symbolize the earth and the earthly wisdom. In the Greek mythology, the earth is female and is called "Gaia". Uranus, who was the embodiment of the sky, slept on the earth (Gaia) giving birth to countless children the youngest of whom was Kronos. Being tired of many childbirths, Gaia asked for help from Kronos. Kronos also cut the father's male device and casted it into the sea (Bron, 1386,15).

Kronos dreamed that he was destroyed by one of his children. He swallowed all his children. But Zeus was saved through fate, then Zeus, with his brothers, rose up against Kronos and he jailed him in the depths of the earth. He himself became similar to Uranus, the God of the heavens. Vikander adapted this Greek myth to the Persian myth of Jamshid, Fereydoun and Zakhak, which in Iran has changed from the form of epics (gods action) into the form of mythology (heros action). Jamshid, like Uranus, has created a celestial / class order against

whom Zahak turned up and collapsed the foundation of that order. Being worried about his sleep like Koronus, Jamshid was jailed in a cave in Damawand which is carried by his descendany Fereydoun. Worried about his sleep, Astyag ordered to kill Cyrus, but he the hands of fate saved Cyrus and Cyrus arrested Astyaga and jailed him in Herkane. Afrasyab was also prisoned in a basement in the same way by his grandson Keykhosrow. Kronos, confederate with his mother, symbolizes human intellect and Zeus symbolizes the metaphysical wisdom. Therefore, the Iranian form of Uranus, Kronos and Zeus can be seen in the epic of Jamshid, Zahak, and Fereydun. Jamshid and Fereydoun are the symbols of a cosmic and masculine order, but Zahak is the sign of the earthly and female order; images have also been discovered from Zahhak being in the form of a woman.

#### Jamshid, Zahak, and Fereydoun:

In the narrative of Jamshid, Zahak, and Fereydoun, the history is intermingled with myth. Some consider it as a legendary narrative, others regard it as historical that has taken the form of expressing myth.

In our opinion, the origin of the story is historical, but the narrative is in the form of the myth. According to this narrative, the legendary king of Iranian, Jamshid, defeated demons and created his own political sovereignty by dividing the `people into four classes. Due to being guilty of pride and arrogance, he committed sins and he is ousted and killed by Zahak's campaign. Then Fereydoun, from the descendants of Jamshid, revolted against Zahak with the help of

Kaveh the Blacksmith against Zahak and he would bring back the sovereignty to the family of Jamshid and would restore the class order of Jamshid disrupted by Zahhak. This is the summary of a story that has been analyzed in many ways. The questions that engage the mind of every researcher in this narrative are whether this narrative has merely the myth or historical root? If it is historical, which historical people its main characters symbolize? Which historical period do they belong to? What meaning does it involve and what ethnic-religious conflict does it signify?

#### Jamshid and his sin

To the extent that the mythology takes Jamshid, the legendary king back to the past, the history takes his time forward. Zarathustra does not have a positive attitude towards Jamshid; he is sacred in Iran's mythology, but he has disconnecte committed the sin and Ferah (glory) has been taken from him; thus, he faced with Zahak's rebellion. Who were Jamshid and Zahhak, and what historical periods do they signify?

Greek sources do not address the developments in eastern Iran and the Mede occupation in the east, and there is no reliable source regarding the developments in those regions. According to the available data, however, we find out about the existence of the dynasty of the Aryans kingdom known as the Kianis in the mythology, that they have been occupied by the Medes and they have accepted the Medes dominance. Henning believes that at the same time as of the Medes, the rule of Khwarazmians existed in the east (Frey, 1344: 65). Iranwich as Marquardt and Nijberger, and Benonist and Henning have stated is the same Khwarizm. The time of

Zarathustra was a some little time before the unification of Iran by Cyrus ... The Khwarizmians had a great empire at that time; for Cyrus to subjugate them, they must have been politically united (Gamman, 1378: 11) because "the easy victory of Cyrus in the east was areason for the existence of a the background of a Median state in eastern Iran "(Fry,1344; 66). We are facing limited documentation and resources to examine the role and sphere of influence of the Medes in eastern Iran (Vogelsang, 1999, 45), but apparently Astyag, the king of the Mede, has had some clashes and frictions with Asiatic nations of Mia and Bacteria and ... (Danmadyev, 1386: 139) .Ketsizas and Diydorus cyclos named a Bacteria that helped Assyrians at the time of the siege of the Assyrian by the Medes' he not only speaks of the self-control of the Bacterians, but also he conveyed their hostility to the growing and fright-ening power of the Medes (Newleys, 1381; 126). In addition, Ketsiz writes about the domi-nation over Bacteria that he later they rebelled against Cyrus soon after his victory and then they obeyed him after becoming aware of the Cyrus's marriage with Amitis, the daughter of the king of the Mede (the same, 127). Along with the advance of the Medes to the east of Iran, Bacteria got out from being an autonomous state and became an affiliated state (the same: 128.:

Although the current sources are contradictory with regard to the sovereignty of Bakrariya or Khwarizm, what is certain is the existence of a dominant Aryan state coinciding with the time of the Medes or even before them in eastern Iran, which has come under the domination of the Medes. There might have been two ethnic groups of Bakterians and Khwarizmians that the Khwarizmians accepted the domination of the Medes, but the bacterians were rebellious towards the Medes because Bacterians defended the Assyrians against the Medes, as Kattisas pointed out, and they also supported the Achaemenids and Cyrus against Astyagh. With the fall of the Medes and the advent of the Achaemenids, the power of the Khwarizmians was reduced and the Bacterians with the Achaemenids support, both anti-Medians, came to power. Marquette is also the first scholar who, according to Herodotus's book, found out about the existence of a government in eastern Iran: "The Bacterians reached the peak of power un-der the supervision of Achaemenid after the collapse of the Khwarizm government (Niolli, the same: 134).

It is likely that the legendary king Jamshid was the king of Khwarazm before being invaded by the Medes. "Soviet archaeologists showed signs of what can be likened to the Warjakerd in some of the remnants of the ancient Khwarizma belonging to the 6th or 5th century AH "(Zarinkoub, 1368, 542). "... This is supposed to be the same Warjamkerd that Jamshid has constructed; a square set ... three roofed rooms ... involving group residence ... "(Wiedigren, 1998: 86) which they have gone under the Medes ruling and they have accepted its Mithraism culture since Zoroaster ( Yasna 32, clause 8) has a contemptuous opinion about him that squeezed the Hom plant and sacrificed the cow that Zarathustra opposed it; in the same way, this point makes him - Jamshid – Come close to Mitra whom Zoroaster has condemned (Widgren, 1377: 87). As based on the existencence of Hom plant and cow-sacrifing or killing in Mithraism, does Jamshid sin have any connection to mede and Mithra?; or in reverse, he has been Median/mithraist and his sin related to Iran and its class-culture which faced the public resurrection of Ajidahak?

According to Shahnameh and Pahlavi's narration, Jamshid's sin was claiming to be God who founded his own government by enslaving the Divans, who are the same Median natives. Enslaving the aboriginals (Divan) by Jamshid and Tahmourth is also reflected in Shahnameh:

No rank but excellence till Tahmiiras,                      Purged of his faults and glorious with the Grace,  
Bound Ahriman with spells and rode him horsewise At whiles around the world. Thereat the  
divs

Rebelled and held a conclave, for their throne Of gold was void. When Tahmuras was ware  
He was enraged and spoiled their trafficking, Girt him with Grace and took his massive mace.  
Then all the divs and warlocks sallied forth A huge magician host. The Black Div led them  
And vapoured, while their shouts affronted heaven. It darkened, earth turned sable and all eyes  
Grew dim. The illustrious worldlord Tahmuras Advanced girt up for battle and revenge.

There were the roar of flame and reek of divs, Here were the warriors of the lord of earth,  
Who ranked his troops and speedily prevailed,                      For of the foe he bound the most by spells  
And quelled the others with his massive mace. The captives bound and stricken begged their  
lives.

"Destroy us not," they said, "and we will teach thee A new and fruitful art." He gave them  
quarter

To learn their secret. When they were released They had to serve him, lit his mind with  
knowledge

Wildurant writes that the Persians learned the Aryan language and their thirty-six letters from  
the Medes (Durant, V.1 406).

According to Ardeshir Khodadayan, all works of art and columns and ...of Persians are  
completely rooted in the art of the Medes. Even Darius, in the design of his inscriptions,  
considered the works of the Medes to be his initiative. In the story of Jamshid, Shahnameh has  
also spoken of slavery:

He bade the foul divs temper earth with water And taught them how to fashion moulds for  
bricks

They laid foudations first with stones and lime, Then raised thereon by rules of art such  
structures

As hot baths, lofty halls, and sanctuaries. He searched among the rocks for stones whose lustre  
attracted him....

As we said before, the Divs and Maznah Dieos are meant to be the Medes. Ater entering the  
eastern area of Mede, Iranians made their aristocracy dominant over the indigenous people, and  
probably Jamshid was one of the first Iranian leaders entering the land that was later called  
Iran. Tahmourth and Jamshid domination over demons means learning their writing system and  
art and the domination over native Medians and cultural and linguistic borrowing from them.  
The Iranians, as Will Durant pointed out, have learned their entire architecture and language  
from the Medes. After the domination of Jamshid on the indigenous people, he attempted to  
replace individual tyranny instead of tribal democracy (Behdad, 1374, p. 33). According to the  
seventh book of Dinkard and Shahnameh, Jamshid divided the society into four classes of

Katouzian (clerics), Nisarians (military), Basoto (farmers), and Otto Khshih (traders); hence, Jamshid became unthankful and oppressive towards the people and dismissed with the rebellion of the people and the help of the Ajidak. People got united with Zahak (in the words of the Shahnameh of the Dragon-body man) and throw him out of the throne. Indeed, the Medians or non-Aryan indigenous people who had gone under the domination of the Aryan invasion led by Jamshid rebelled against Zakhak (here, probably Hox-eshtera meaning the chosen king), and they rebelled against Jamshid.

Ferdowsi described the story of the rebellion against Jamshid and the power of Zahak's arrival:

Thereafter tumult, combatting and strife      Arose throughout Iran, the bright day gloomed  
And men renounced Jamshid, who when his grace      Was darkened, turned to folly and  
perverseness

Pretenders started up on every march The disaffected nobles levied troops

And strove. Some set forth for Arabia,      For they have heard: "There is a monarch there  
An awe-inspiring monarch of dragon-visage."      Thus all the discontented cavaliers Went to  
Zahhak and offered fealty, Saluting him a monarch of Iran.

The king of dragon-visage came like wind And donned the Iranian crown collected troops

The bravest of Arabia and Iran      And having seized the throne of King Jamshid

Slipped on the world as 'twere a finger-ring

However, calling Zahhak as Tazi (Arab) is originated in the time of Ferdowsi era and it is the result of the propaganda of Sheobias movement to excite the Iranian feelings against the Arabs and the hatred of Iranians from the conquest of their country by the Arabs (Curtis, 1388: 38). In this narrative, Jamshid's autocracy and the dissatisfaction of the people, who have accepted Zahhak's domination with open arms, have been noted .

We will return to the story of Zahak, but what was the main sin of Jamshid, who was subjected to Zoroastrian misconduct. In Yasnah 32, Section 8, the Jamshid sin is sacrificing the cow. "Among the wicked, Jam the son of Viyohont, is well-known as well, which Khshnvdknan people, parts of the meat eat" (Yasna quoted Molton, (62: 1387 in the Shahnameh of Shah alleged gods in the Vedas bed with sisters. Deal Iranian civilization matriarchal West Asia, which incest in the drawing was in bed with another sister sin not. so, Iranian mythology about the sin of Jamshid were confused, then blame God for it gave him (the spring. (230: 1376 Shahnam He considers the sacrifice of a cow, which has, to a degree, been more specific to Jamshid's sin. In Bundhain (Chapter 31 and 23), it has also been indirectly referred to the Jamshid's guilty, that Jamshid, from the fear of the Divine-Shi'ida-Devis She got her wife and her sister Davy to that of monkeys and bears and losers They stood up and turned his Frhayzdy (Bundahishn quoted Khlan, 83: 1375) previously. We pointed out that the mith-raans killed or sacrificed the cow. Therefore, in Zoroaster's view, Jamshid's guilt is infected with mitra's ritual. He has read the word "Zaznahahi" ("Medi"). So what is certain is that Jam-shid's sin in the Medes and their Mithraist religion is not unrelated. Jam lure Court has eaten and beef mysterious to our people eat (Molton. (62: 1387-drivers who seem to represent the beef was



the first Astzahra. This inspired him from the Court's Court that he surrendered They are their lies (the same:.) Rice is what is Satan. Rhodi is a positive concept in material-ism, but in metaphysical religions, he became a devil, a shameful word of yours, as if crazy from the devil. Omid Jamshid is the same dance and the mockery of Gowushi and happiness that is related to the Devil's Shadow. In order to recognize Jamshid's guilt, we should know what alternative in Iranian mythology, regardless of Jamshid's genus, is for him?

When Farah was detached from Jamshid, it would go to Mithra (Iranians Mithra...), Garshasb and Fereydoun. "Farah fled from Jamshid, and Fereydoun, Mitra and Gershasb took it." After separating from Jamshid, Farah goes to the military men, Fereidoun the capturer of Zahhak ;Germasb his killer at the end of the world, it is indeed "near Damavand, where the Mithra stood on his feet, and this is the same mountain where Fereydoun imprisoned Ajidahak, who at the end of the time will be killed by Garshasb" (Russell, Dehbashi, the same, 772) .Farah Shahi will eventually gets to the three men who have a hand in imprisoning or killing Ajidahak (Zahak). It is needed to reiterate that that Iranianized /Zoroasterized is not the same prior Median Mithra.s Widengern has pointed out "does not this mean that Kingly glory (Farah Shahi) stay at the hands of army?" (Widigren, 1377: 87). Jam the owner of Farah, who has three duties of monarchy, flocking and war with the Deows (demons) ... but his military aspect is less than the other three. ... "(the same: 89). This is a peaceful character that makes it difficult for Ajidehak to fight against him, and, instead of fighting, he runs away from the battle, and says do not kill me I am the ruler of the world (ibid: 89). Jam can not fight and his weakness comes from this against the usurper (Zahak, Ghaderi) ( the same, 91.) According to the collected facts, it is possible to assume that Jamshid's main sin was his defeat against or making peace or not fighting against the Medes (Zahhak), because FarahIzadi only goes to those who arrest and kill Zakhak. Fereydoun the destroyer of Zahak, Garshasib his killer, and Mitra (Iranian Mithra) the guard of his cave.

Therefore, Jamshid has probably been the king of Khwarazm (Iran or Iranwiji) in the 6th Century AH. M, who has gone under the domination of the Medes. His unforgivable sin was that he succumbed to or made peace with the Divan and Zahak (Medes), and he has taccepted their Mithraist ceremonies like killing the cow or drinking the hemos, while raging war or killing Divans/Medes is a prerequisite for the religion, purity and becoming Iranian in the Iranian/Zoroasterian political wisdom. Since the Iranian political thought whether military( the Achaemenid), or the religious (Zoroastrian), or mythological (Fereydoun and Keykhsro) was founded in opposition or the negation of the Medes. Therefore, "the pattern of events and personalities posed in the Avestas are often Median and Achaemenid, and its organiers, Zoroasterian scholars or Moges, often attended the Achaemenid court. The Zoroastrian religion was somehow utilised in support of the Achaemenid kings and they deteriorated their ene-mies, who have been their common enemies, as far as they could". "(Hossein Zadeh, 1384, 98.) The guilt of Jamshid as an Iranian nobleman has been making peace instead raging war with the Medes.

In Zoroastrian, like Christianity, "Meshi and Meshiane being corrupted by the Demons would be compensated and restricted only by the religion of Zarathushtra" (Pharaoh Dan, quoted from Zener, the same, 76). Zoroaster has appeared for the sake of reforming and punishing the sinners; in the Goths, the redeam of the sin in the hereafter has acquired a special place. The path to salvation and getting rid of those sins is to follow the Ashe. "Through the merci-ful

Minoan or with the support of Ermitati and Asheh, this would change the opinion of many of the people who are prepared to hear the message (Isaiah 47, clause 6). Therefore, the only way to save from sin is to restore the Ashe order, and we have already said that Ashe is the hierarchical order of the cosmos which, in the philosophy of Zoroastrianism, is the political order in the continuation of the cosmic hierarchical order in the class based way in which the king is on the top. In other words, the only way to save and the truth is absolute obedience of the monarchy and political Zoroastrian religion, and the opponents of political order are evil and liars. Therefore, in all heavenly religions, the original scheme of the sin is for tormenting the man, and the way to save them from the punishment is the absolute obedience of the religion owners.

In Vedic mythology, Jam is the master of world of the dead who have reached prosperity. He is the ruler of Paradise and is the friend of gods, especially with Varuna and Egani, the god of fire ... Yama a god along with Varuna - both of which are the same - find the hidden fire; Yama sometimes even has the name of God, Yamma and Varuna – Uranus, Two Kings who are comforting the dead, have the best of the heaven at their disposal, they are in the sky, they have a sister named Yama and the people of the world are the sons of this siblings" (Ba-har, 1376: 225). Thus, if we find it out in a non-historical and mythical form, as Wikider corectly compares Jamshid with Uranus, the God of heaven and hierarchical justice, compares Zahak with Kronos and Fereydoun with Zeus, we see that Yama, who is the same Jamshid, is compared with Uranus, which after the prevalence of monotheism and the replacement of heroism with mythology, was nicknamed Jamshid king. As Kronos rose as the representative of the earth (Gaia) against the heaven (Uranus), or as he uprose from the mother (Gaia) against Father (Uranus), Zahhak also revolted as the representative of the land and the wom-an against both his own father and Jamshid, i.e. his heaven and heavenly legitimacy. The name of Zahak, that is, Ajidahak meaning the snake and the serpants on the knoacle of Zahak, is the representative of the earth and rebelliousness of the human intellect against the domination of the general principles of metaphysics and religion and social affinities.

Zahak represents the "Asen Kherad" and Jamshid represents "Goshan Serod- e kherad". "Before coming to thr throne an as the result of stealing Asen Kherad by Divans,... the modest wisdom was ruined against the devil of going to extremes ... the system of the world got distraught .... Jam removing the Demon from the kingdom and saved the goddess of Asen Kherad from the Demon of going t extremes, and he resparked the godly Asen Kherad - the growth and exaltation - and he defeated the extremes of being a Dive and he reinforced the moderation of Asen Kherad due to the failure of the Demons, and It truncated the world with it ... It spreaded godly Asan Kherad among the people and it made Asan Kheradi and justice as victorious and made the creation of Jamshid as non-diable "(Bundashen, quoted fro Bahar,1376: 222, 223). Asan Kherad is the wisdom special to Demons, that is, the Medes that Jamshid took it from the demons and through making it godly and furnishing it helpt the creation of Hormazd. It all means that the Aryans / Persians took the wisdom and civilization and the writing system from the Medes but made it heavenly and religious. They adopted the Median government system but added the metaphysical legitimacy and the divine right to it, they transformed it from earthly / contract legitimacy into metaphysical / heavenly legitimacy. They acquired the earthly epics of Yashts from the Medes and made it religious / heavenly. They took the anti-sun and earthly Mithra from the Medes and made it solar and heavenly. They took Asan Kerad or the wisdom of the Medes and, by making it religious / spiritual turned it into the Goshan Serod

Kherad. As Jamshid, in his confrontation with the demons / the Medes, "abstracted the Asan Kherad into the Goshan Serod Kherad", Zarathustra also added Mazda meaning wise to Ahura and after separating from Mitra, it became Ahura Maz-da, i.e. the wise God. This was the beginning of the separation of the wisdom from non-wisdom, the logos from Eros, and the heaven from the earth, which was the very development of reason or metaphysical law (Goshan Serod Kherad) instead of the human intellect (wisdom).

Jamshid means the blazing sun. "Jamshid's epithet, i. e. Foruzan - Khashite - is the description of the sun, too. In both Iran and India, Jamshid is also the son of Vysonet-Viyohont, that is, the Sun ... the Sun King, which is not unlike the Egyptian pharaohs" (Gamman, 2009, 49). However, Zahak was imprisoned by Fereidoun in a cave in Damavand. The conflict between Zahhak cave and Jamshid sun is the same contrast between Mitra and Zoroaster Ahuramazda which we stated before.

Of course, as we said, it is still too early to make a definitive comment on this. Due to the Kurdish / Mithrai being of this word, which is also evident in the Yarsanan Jamkhane (worshipping house), Jam might have been a Median king and his pride and sin might have been the transition from a chosen king with a social contract / Mitra to tyranny. Under the influence of the migrant Iranian, he may have taken God / the earthly king up to the sky and he may have claimed to be god or the representative of the metaphysical god. Ferdowsi's Shahnameh, which is the confiscation of Kurdish Shahname, considers his sin as the pride and the claim of being God. Perhaps his sin was transition from democracy (primitive) to tyranny, the transition from the contract to the divine right of the kings and the transition from equality to the foundation of class structure. He is also the founder of class structure; thus, people would get dissatisfied with him, terminated the contract and revolt that the Zahak re-volt was against the tyrant

Jamshid. Therefore, Zahak dissolves the class structure and places the contract instead of the divine right of the kings, he brings the earthly Median god that passed into heaven back to the earth. He prevents the penetration of the divine thought of the Persians from entering into the ruling system; thus, Persians abhorred him and took their re-venge from Zhak/Medes with the help of Kave/Harpag the traitor. In fact, Zahhak's myth has been reversed that the Persians confiscated and diverted it. Kaveh the justice seeker of the Iranian myths has been the same just Zahak, and the ruthless Zahak has been the same oppressing Jamshid, and he had been the other or evil of the hierarchical / godly culture of the invading Persians who reversed the meaning and the other of it. This hypothesis is likely to be true because we said that Jamshid was the King of Khwarizm; Khwarazm is a Median word and they were the allies of the Medes. After the domination of Cyrus, the importance of Khwarazm got diminished and anti-Median Bacterium emerged. Besides, if his sin was getting defiled with Mitra, he would have to face the Iranian's turbulence, not the Median / Zahhak's riot. Nonetheless, in the absence of more complete information, the first hypothesis is more affordable now.

Zahak / Ajayadk

If we take into account the social interaction of the fall of the Medes and the reign of the Achaemenids and reconsider the mythology of Iran, we conclude that most of Iran's mythological stories have originated from this historical event (Hosseini Zadeh, 1384, 98). The myth of Fereydoun and Zahhak is also the historical story of Cyrus and Astyagh. Even if it is

not rooted in this historical event, and it has already existed in the form of an ancient aristocratic mythology, it later became an epic and it was molded on the story of Cyrus and Astiag. The battle of Fereydoun and Zahak is not only derived from a historical event, but also it is an old version of the Ahura struggle with Ahriman / Mitra. Zahak is the same as Ajidak, meaning the dragon and the snake, has two snakes on the knuckle, Fereydoun is also raised by a wellgrounded cow and the Kavian's banner is also the same as the cow flag. Zahak killed a strong cow which has raised Fereydoun connotating the killing of the cow by Mitra. "Fereydoun also chokes Zahhak in the blood of the cow. Cow had been the totem of Iranians and snake the totem of Medes and Mitra. The conflict between Zahak and Fereydoun is the reproduction of the struggle between Mede and Pars, Snake and Cow, Mitra and Zoroaster, and ultimately Cyrus and Astyagh.

The Median being of Zahhak and Cyrus being of Fereydoun

Based on the viewpoint of this author, concepts such as Zahhak more than being related to a particular person are the symbol of a culture and in address to the totality of Medes; however, some characters also play a central role in this myth. "Is Zahak the snake on knuckle or Ajidak the same Asatiag, i.e. the king of Mede and Kaykhsrou, the same as Cyrus, and why is the life story of Fereydoun the same as Cyrus?" (Ziapour, Bitá: 5.) Why is the story of Fereydoun and Zahak reminds us of the story of Astyag and Cyrus (ibid, 9). Zahak is the Arabized of Ajidahak. Iranians changed the Devil Dhahak a little to the Arabic Zakhak in order to be regarded as an Arab evil king, and the Arabs themselves also believed, and the self-affirmation of the Yamani people also caused them to make the genealogy up for Zahak ..." (Noldeka, 2537, 45). As Rawlinson has indicated, the Ajdahs consists of two components of the Aji, meaning dragons, representing the Astyagh, and Dehak is the same as the Diokes (Ziapour, the same:17). Aji is the first part of the name Ajayidk meaning dragon or serpent; the serpent or dragon has been the totem of Zahak's ethnic group, which has also been the totem of the Median people (Behdad, 1374, 41). Dehak could also have been taken from Diaaco meaning the sin in a way that they turned Diwako in the form of the Akwan Div.

In the paragraph "19 Ramyesht", the Ajidak in the Kowirint Dozzit brought ransom for Wayo at the top of the golden tree, the Kowirint is called Kerend at the top of the mountain that Zahak offered ransom to the angel of the weather; the same mountain that is called Asproch in Bandhesh, in Shahnameh Esproz and Greeks called it Zagros (Kalan, the same: 88 – 87). Zakhak has sacrificed in Zagros, Zagros is the permanent place of the Medes, today there is a village of the same name, Esproz, in Kurdistan; as well Bundeshan (chapter 20-23) writes: "Zahak in Atropatkan prayed Ahriman, and in the Sepidrud in Atropatkan, Zahak demanded Ahriman to fulfil his demands and his demons: Atropatkan is also the same as Minor Media. Therefore, Fereydoun is the same as Cyrus, and the dream story of Astyag and Zahak is the same (Kalan, 1375: 226).

In mythology, Fereydun imprisoned Zahak in Damavand. In history, Cyrus sends Astiag on exile to the same places; according to Katsias, he exiled him to Barakanians in the same areas. Astigh realizes his government being in danger from beside his girl's grandson following a dream, Zahhak is facing such a situation, too. Like the narration of Herodotus regarding Astyagh, the priests are afraid of his dream interpretation.

None dread to speak

Their fortune was in jeopardy three days.

Upon the fourth the Shah was wroth, exclaiming:

“Fortell the future or be hung alive”

According to history of Tabarī, Zahak is the relative of Fereydoun. Tabari writes that Jamshid gave his sister to one of the elders of his country and appointed him as the ruler of Yemen (Tabarī). Fereidoon is the son of Zahak (Tabari, quoting ErfanManesh, 1388: 213). On the other hand, Fereidoun is from the descendants of Jamshid; hence, in both stories there is a kinship relation between the king and the exceptional child of fate growth, both of which are grown up under some conditions in the wilderness and an animal milked them. Kaveh Ahangar joined Kaveh and united people against Zahak as the result of the death of his son. Kaveh is the same Harpag who joined the same harpag which joined Cyrus through the unification of the troops against Astyag, due to the death of his son by Astyagh. After overcoming the Ajidak, Cyrus married Amitis, his daughter. Fereidounnyiz entered the "Gange Dej Hokht after subduing Ajidahak and married his women take him to (Taken from Zahak's book of myth-181). The Ganges have seven fortresses, which undoubtedly were the same fortress in the Hegmataneh (the same: 185). In Shahnameh, Hamedan was also called HongDej (Kaplan, the same, 235. Thus Hang Dejj was also termed as Hokheshesh"

Today it's known among the Arabs as “the holy place” The fair tall palace of Zahhak was builded there

The same GangDej of Afrasiab was destroyed by Keikhosrow. Therefore, Zahak / Ajidak are intened to mean Astiag and Medes. Sultan Ishagh, who is a holy person among the Yarsan Kurds today is probably the same Sultan Zahak. Zahak is apparently the Arabicized term of Isac (Russell, Dehbashi, 1388: 772). Also, the Zakhak castle, which later became the Babak castle (Kalan, 1375: 164) dates back to the sixth and seventh centuries BC and relates to the Medes and Mannids first discovered by the German Archeology Board in 1971 and is situated in Azerbaijan (Minor mede) ([Http://www.tebyan.net](http://www.tebyan.net)).

Zahak beyond the Iranian goodness and evil of Iran Kaveh- Harpag

The Shahnameh is the philosophical foundation of Iran history and the Ajem's (Persians) Qur'an and the complete dimensional mirror of Iranian knowledge and pesteme (Safa, 1385: 215). Thus, let us first read this narration from the language of Ferdowsi, and then we will analyze it. The Shahnameh calls Zahak's father as Mardas:

One of the desert-spear armed Bedouins of noble birth, then lived a virtuous king,  
Just, high born, generous, and hight Mardas sighs who sought his God with reverence and

He had a son whom much he loved- Zhahak a gallant prince but frivolous and hasty  
Ferdowsi called Zahak's father as Mardas. Marsas - as Zarinkoub said - meant a cannibal, a nickname that was later given to the father of Babak Khoramdin. Das is the same “deha”, meaning snake and dragon. "In the Veda, Fereydoun killed a snake called Das, which has turned into Dehak in Pahalvi" (Piraniya, 1383: 106). In Aryan / Iranian culture, “Das” has always been

the enemy of the Aryan gods and it represent the indigenous resistance to the invasion of the Aryans. "One of the enemies of the gods in the" Vedas " are the Dassids representing indigenous people's resistance to the Aryans ... In Iran, Mardas, Zahak's father may be similar to it ... because Zahhak Indicates the native uprising against the Aryans "(Bahar, 1376, 481). Thus, as the natives in India and Rig Veda were dubbed as Dasa and Dragons, in Iran, too, Mardas from the root of Dasa is the same badge of Zahak the snake on shoulder (Ajidak), which represents the indigenous resistance against the invasion of the Aryans with the totem of snake worshipping and we have already proved their Median being and their snake worshipping action. In fact, Ahriman and Dave in the Zoroastrian mythology has changed into Dasa, Dahak and Ajidahak in the mythology of Achaemenid in the Zoroastrian mythology. The Medes and their Mithratian religions have been the common enemy of the religion and political system of Iranians. The culture and religion of the Medes, namely, Mitra, has transformed into the form of Ahriman and Dave in Iranian religion and culture, and the Medes themselves have become Dehak and Dassah Ajayadk in the national mythology of the Achaemenid Persians,

The Iranian political intellect, which has been represented in Shahnameh, knowingly has considered the name of Zahak's father as Mardas from the root of "Daseh", which means the dragon and the serpent being introduced as the foe of the cow and the nickname of Ajayadk or Zahak. "Vishtasp would save Deona from prison, Deona's root, Dahn, means milk-giver cow ... this is the rival of the devil himself and Dasa that met the same daha or Ajayidhek - and he is trying to get rid cows and women in the battle with him (Wedengern, 137). Zahak is the same horrible dragon that steals the cows, and the kings and the heroes perform the blessing with this dragonkilling "(Bahar, 1376, 191)

Let's read the rest of the story from Ferdowsi's language that Satan, as a good man, appears on Zahhak and tempts him to kill his father.

One day Iblis approached him as a friend	And led his wits astray. The youth gave ear
With pleasure and all unsuspectingly	Gave to Iblis heart, reason and pure soul,
And heaped the dust on his own head. Iblis	Exulted seeing that the youth was snared
And gulled the simpleton with specious words	Thus saying: "I could tell thee many
things	
Known to myself alone".	The youth made answer:
"Tell me at once, my worthy monitor!	ry."
	Iblis replied: "First promise, then my sto-
The guileless youth swore as Iblis dictated:	"Thy secret shall be kept, thy bidding
done."	
Then said Iblis: "Great prince! Shall any rule	Here but thyself? What profiteth a sire
	....
With such a son? Now hearken to my rede:	the lifetime of this ancient potentate
Continueth, thou art shelved. Sieze on his court	And goods. His place will suit thee, thou
shalt be	
King of the world if thou durst do my bidding" ....	

Yet that abandoned youth respected not                      His father, but conspired to shed his blood  
 I heard a sage once say: "Though fierce in strife      No son dares to take his father's life ...  
 Vile and unjust Zahak thus seized the throne...

We see that Zachak was misled by the temptation of the devil and sold his soul to Satan in exchange for worldly bliss. Zahhak was a covenant with Satan, and rebelled against the gods. In Bundeshan, Zahhak and Satan alliance somehow is also confirmed. Bhandishan writes: "Zahak prayed at Aroupatkan to Ahriman. In Sepidrud of Etoropatkan, Zahak asked Ahriman to fulfill his cause and that of his own Dives" (chapter 23-20). But what and who his devil is that has become a symbol of error and all the filthiness. We have already said- See Zarathustra's advent philosophy- which Zoroastrians intention of Ahriman and Satan is the same Mithra and Median customs. "In Zoroaster's religion, Mehr is the representation of devil, and the name of Satan exists in Zoroastrianism" (Hinelz, 1385: 128). After the escape from Madad, in the words of Bartholomew, Zarathushtr formulated the image of the evil world of his mind. Against the evil world of Mitterah / Međian, Zoroaster abstracted the image of the goodness universe of Ahwari / Aryan. He abstracted the Median god, Mithra as the devil and their culture and civilization as the devilish rituals and he established the foundation of his religion and goodness against it. Most scholars agree that "other monotheistic religions have borrowed the concepts of paradise and hell, Satan (devil), and later-secularism ... from the religion of Zoroasterianism (Bahar, Ismailpour, 1384: 421). What the devil means in all religions is the same qualities attributed to him in Zoroastrianism abstracted from the customs and culture of the Medes. The meaning of Satan in the Zoroastrian and Semitic religions and the Greek metaphysical philosophy is the preference of the objective flesh over the soul, the earth over heaven, the life and human instincts to the hollow generalities of reason, spirituality and religion.

Alliance of Zahak / Ajidak with Iblis is an alliance with Mitra and antagonism to Ahura / Zoroastrianism. It is Zahak's loyalty to Mitra and repeating Mitra's ritual in the killing of cow / metaphysics and the growth of the snake on Zahak's shoulder is the confirmation of the human / terrestrial intellect against the metaphysical law and the preference of the world for the hereafter. Satan is our embodiment of the Mede (Kurd) and we (Kurds/Medes) are the manifestation of Satan; however, Iblis is the name Zarathushtra has molded upon it, as the negative and evil meaning and is the construction of the metaphysical mind of Zarathustra while its name is not Satan and it does not have negative meaning. In religious delusions, negative loading has been molded on it. Nonetheless, the Mithra of contract was against the divine right of the kings with the preference of reason over the law, equality over hierarchy, earth on the sky, joy to religion, and so on. God, as the creator of the heavens and the earth, ... first found meaning with Zoroaster and came to other monotheistic religions of the Jews, Christians and Islam. Thus, essentially, God or the gods appeared versus to and based on the negation of the Mede / Mitra. Satan's absence is due to the abandonment of Medes in history. Satan's monophyleticism is a symbol of Kurd's hatreds.

Zahak changes his appearance and becomes a dragon and a snake on shoulder when he contracts with the devil. The relationship between the marriage contract of this devilish covenant with the devil and the apparent alteration of Zahhak is merriful and fascinating (Curtis, 1388: 38). Therefore, calling the Medes as the dragon, the snake on shoulder, snaky-hair and ... is because of their covenant with the devil / Mitra and their opposition to Gods.

The oblivion of the earth and the individual and the domination of the metaphysical general principles over the individual continued in all cultures until the era of contemporary with FaustGote as their representatives. Faust is a reproductive myth of Prometheus. In fact, Prometheus and Faust are the western form of mythical Zachak. As Kronos, the father killer is also a Greek version of Zakhak the father-killer.

According to this myth (Prometheus): Zeus, the gods of gods, seeks to eliminate human beings from using the fire and the brightness, but Prometheus abducts the seed of fire (the symbol of the wisdom) and gives it to man, and because of this, he was are hated and rejected by the gods. The gods who are concerned that Prometheus has given the wisdom and the knowledge being especial to gods cursed Prometheus angrily. It is similar to the same mythology of Sami / Judah, i.e Adam and Eve who, with the misleading of devil / serpent, ate the fruit of knowledge. Thus, because of the fear that human beings, similar to the gods who are knowledgeable, no longer need the commandments and the law of the gods, the gods rejected Adam and Eve and cursed the snake and the devil. Prometheus is the same snake, especially since the eagle, from behalf of Zeus, is eating the lever of Prometheus every da and Perseus in the form of and along with an eagle would kill the snaky-hair Medusa . Prometheus is the Greek form of Mitra / Zakhak.

The only myth in the East - as Jalal Sattari is - with an rioting proletariat against the gods - is Zahhak's myth. Zahhak sold his soul to the devil in favor of mankind and earth against God. Zahhak, like Prometheus, along with Engerhemino (Ahriman) and Akhman Dave, is trying to silence the gods facing the resistance of Izad Azar, Bahman and Septan Minoo. The battle between the ether, the fire and Ajidahak is over silencing farah-Izadi (Hinelz, 1380: 49). The battle of Zahhak with fire is the battle of Satan with God, and the human contract and the Godly hierarchy. Avesta considers the Ajydak as an enemy of the god of Azar or fire. The fire was the partner of the true order. Asha or Arta has an ethical and cosmological value. It is a means for testing the innocence ... links him with justice (Gaiman, 1378: 47, 48). "Zarathus-tra ... believes in the inherent equality between fire and law since the law is the manifestation of the justice of the wise God" (ibid: 48). Ordibehesht or Ashe represents divine law and it is the moral order of God in the world. His main riva l is the spirit of apostasy in man since apostasy disposes man from the law and order of God (Hinelz, the same: 74). Therefore, Zahak, who is introduced as the enemy of fire, becomes the enemy of the true divine order and the cosmic ethos of Ahura Mazda so as to have defended a contractive/earthly order. His feud with fire and light, shows his similarity with Mitra and their ceremony in the darkness of the cave. We said that Mitra's ceremony is held inside a dark cave away from the sun and Mi-tra is born with a torch in his hand in which torch is the anti-sun. where the sun does not exist like the dark cave, the torch is used.

In Fausti's play written by Gothe, there are similarities with Zahhak's mythology. As Zachak got diverted as the result of the devil's temptation, Faustette has also gone astray due to the charm of the virtuoso (Satan), and, in the face of worldly pleasures, he sold his soul to Satan, and turned back on God. Faustette is an aging scientist who gives the devil the Spirit of God in return of achieving a girl named Marguerite and also getting the pleasure of the world and youth. Fawcett was busy worshiping and praying for many years. At the end of his age, he thought that for what he took all the pleasures of youth and happiness? Satan will rise upon him, and promises him that he would give back all the pleasures of a young age to him, provided that he would break his covenant with God and make contract with him (Satan). We see that in



the Faust story, Satan is a symbol of happiness and delight in this world, a symbol of prosperity in this earthly world. Faust - in the words of Jalal Sattari - is the symbol of the state and modern civilization, which would restore the dignity of the divine kingdoms to so-cial contract. As Mitra meant social contract and material state based on it. Instead of pros-perity in the world, he tries to realize worldly prosperity and bring heaven to earth, the same materiel campus. Leviathan Hobbes can also be a symbol of the Faust, Zahak, and Prome-theus. Leviathan, the enemy of the Lord, the God of the Jews, is derived from the same devil Zarathushtra, who is against the Lord's cosmic order. Hobbes, who founded the foundation for legitimacy and social contract, and drove the root of metaphysical legitimacy, called his book Leviathan, the anti-God. Therefore, Satan or Ahriman, who is the abstraction of the civilization and culture of the Medians, transformed from Zoroasterian religion to other reli-gions; it has also been the basis of all intellectual and political rebukes. The Faust Satan and Hobbez Prometheus and Leviathan are the same Median Mithra that is the break with God and the covenant with Satan in Faust and Leviathan, the return of the Mithra and the decline of Zarathustra.

The devil tries to deny the domination of the general principles of individual life and in-stincts. It was the same devious Kurdish culture that continued in the Mazdakyan and Khur-damin movement. They preferred the earth and instinct and sexual freedom and liberation to heaven, God and spirituality. In fact, Faust is the symbol of the West's civilization, which went from Plato to Renaissance to seek the heavenly illusions and the fate of the hereafter. After understanding its illusion, the west tried to realize the paradise on earth and to go to find true happiness on i

Another point in the drama showing that it is similar to the Kurds culture is that: at the beginning of the play, when God comes out of the gates of heaven, and all the angeles stand in line, glorify and praise god, Satan criticizes God and this ponit that how miserable he has created the man. The devil tells God that you have given the animal instincts to man, but you expect him/her the worshipping of the angels? Or you should have created him like wiseless animals or like angels without nstincts. In response, God also curses him why you do not ap-plause me like the rest of my angeles. This story remind us of a popular narrative among the Kurds who has a lot of value with this difference that we (the Kurds) has not have Goethe, Ashil, and Sophocles to versify it. It is narrated that when Mohammed the Prophet (pbuh) emerged, people from different nations would go to pay him respect and to praise him, and each of them would refer to him with concepts such as "Al-Salam Alikom O Rasulullah" or "salute you the essence of creation". However, when it was Kurds turn, they rudely and con-temptuously addressed him as "Ka Hama Chony" ( Howdy Hama) "(in Kurdish, this term is a humiliating address for the others), the Prophet extended his hands up to the sky in anger and requested God that the Kurds could never achieve independence and government.

Let's return to the discussion, Zahak's alliance with the devil and his ignorance of God indicates that Zakhak is the continuity of the same devil (Mitra), the earth, the earthly' legitimacy, and it prefers the liberation of Dionysius to the heavens, and the metaphysical spirituality and the divine right of the kings or Fareh Izadi. In fact, the devil appears in shape of Zahak (Azhydak in Avesta) (Curtis, 1388, 38). Let's read the rest of the story from the language of Shahnameh:

Zahak was wont, such was his evil nature, riors to choose him one among his war-  
 And slay him for conspiring with the divs Moreover, all the lovely noble  
 maidens  
 Secluded in their bowers, not tanged of tongues, he took for handmaids.  
 Not a jot had he Of faith, king's uses, or morality  
 He answered: "Live, O king! In wealth amd power. My heart is thine, thy favour my  
 soul's food;  
 Yet would I ask one boon above my station: 'Tis leave to kiss and lay my face  
 and eyes  
 Upon thy shoulders."Off his guard Zahak grace Replied: "I grant it; it may do thee  
 Iblis received permission, kissed and vanished. A marvel followed from the  
 monarch's shoulders  
 Grew two black snakes. Distraught he sought a cure they And in the end excised them, but  
 grew.  
 Again! Oh strange! Like branches from a tree turn The ablest leeches gave advice in

After the Devil's agreement with Zahhak, he takes a kiss on his knuckle in the form of a therapist to relieve Zahak's pains and then two snakes grow from his shoulders.

Grew two black snakes. Distraught he sought a cure And  
 in the end he excised them, but they grew.

Again! Oh strange! Like branches from a tree

On the one hand, Zahak's snakes represent sexual rebellion or, better to say, the rebellion of life and personal instincts and human intellect against the domination of metaphysical generalities. On the other hand, it is the symbol of totem of Mede / Mitra. Zahak's pain, which causes the snake to grow with the kiss of Satan is the pain of social / religious rigor and the pain of metaphysical imprints; the growth of the snake reveals instinctive emancipation and human freedom against the religious / metaphysical provisions that Ferdowsi also says Not a jot had he Of faith, king's uses, or morality

We have already talked about the role of the snake in the Mithra religion and Kurd/Mede's culture, and we said that the Median totem was snake and Mitra is in the form of snakes and along with it. The snake is the symbol of earth and human intellect. Zhahak's snakes on his knockles and Zahak's own name, Ajidak, shows his parallel with Mitra, and the totem of the Medes. Unlike the other cultures, the snake has a benevolent role in the culture of the Kurds (Nikitin, 1998, 535) while Zoroaster considers the serpent the greatest lie and creation of Ahriman and the destructor of the universe (Pirnia, 102 (2004)

Zahak's myth - in the words of Behdad - is the war between the totems, the cow totem and the snake totem. The story of Kaveh and Zahhak is the reproduction of the battle of Mithra-ism and Maddesina. (Behdad, 1374, 15). Faranak, the mother of Fereydoun, breeds Fereydoun through Bermaya, a holy cow. "Zahak killed Fereydoun's father, Abtin, and Faranak, the mother of Fereydoun, gave milk to Fereydoun from Barmaya cow ... As Zahak was informed, Faranak escaped, and Zahak killed Barmaya, the cow" (Safa, 1384, 461). The sacred cow is killed by Zahak, but Fereydoun escapes from Zahak. Killing a sacred cow by Zahak is the reflection of the killing of the first sacred cow by Mitra. As Zarathustra emerged to defend the first cow against Mitra, Fereidoon, too, rose against Zahak and choked him up in the blood of the cow. The body of the Ajidak or Zakhak is full of scallops and snakes (amozgar, 2006: 82). The scarecrow and snake are the same companions of Mitra in the cow-killing ceremony (See pictorial image of cowkilling).

"When Zahak was taken to Fereydoun, Zahak said," for the sake of the blood of your ancestor don't kill me, Fereydoun said, "I will kill you to the blood of the bull in the house of my ancestor" (the same :13).

My sire was fortune's favorite      But still seized on him in Iran  
And slew him cruelly, so I have set      My face against Zahak's throne in revenge.  
He slew the cow Birmaya too – my nurse      A very gem of beauty, what could he,  
That vilian, gain by slaughtering that dumb beast

Fereydoun belongs to the patriarchal society and his weapon is the black ox-headed mace (Viedigren, 1377, 81). He ordered the blacksmith to make a ox-headed mace before the battle began (Curtis, 2009: 42) and with the same mace, he kills Zahak:

Now I am ready and I purpose war      I came not from Iran to bring him pardon,  
Or good will, but to brain him in revenge with this ox-headed mace ....  
His feet no sooner rested on the ground      Than Faridun rushed on him like the wind  
And beat his helm in with      with the ox-head mace

In Asaro Al-Baqiyah, Bironi writes that Fereydoun rescued the oxes imprisoned by Zahak following his arrest of Zahhak. It is like "Indra in India's mythology, which killed the threeheaded and six eyes dragon called" Vishuchropheh "and frees the cows that were imprisoned by him in the cave" (Razi., 1382: 156). As Ajayid became the nickname of Astyagh, the name and nickname of Fereydoun and his ancestors are also derived from the cow. In Asaro Al-

Baqiyah, it is asserted regarding the ancestors of Fereydoun that "Fereydoun bin Saqiyan-Kaw bin Saqiyan-Niknao bin-e-Shah Kav and ... Ben-Jamshid" (bironi quoted by Behdad, the same, 15). Shahrokh Moshkoub also confirms that Fereydoun's ancestors had the nickname of a cow. "Fereydoun the son of Portera - Pourgaw - the son of Sayyak Terra - the Sacchus cow - the son of Septa Terra - the Sepidgau - ... the son of Jam" (Safa, 1384: 464).

The Totem war between the Medes and the Persians, namely the battle of the snake and the bull, is not merely confined to Fereydoun: the names of Derafsh (emblem) of Kavian and Kaveh are also the blacksmith derived from cow. "The name of the cow accompanies the name of Cyrus, and the Kaveh' flag is derived from Gaosh Derafsha, i. e. the banner of the ox and Kaveh corresponds to the Harpagh" (Kahlan, 1375: 230). Yasnya, 57, has also spoken about the ox' banner, that Yvesti and Barthelemy called it "the Derfsh (flag) of Kavian but Christensen rejected it (Christensen, 1343: 85). Kaveh is the same Harpag, which betrayed the Medes and provided the domination of the Persians over the Medes. The symbol of the cow in Kaveh / Harpag's name was the signal of his mental occupation by Iranian / Zoroastrian, and the capture of his mind was the cause of his betrayal and it is the indication of the intellectual and religious influence of Iran / Zoroaster in Media.

Therefore, the Kavian flag from the name Kaveh is also derived from the word "cow". "Kaveh" has been originated from the sacred cow as a symbol of the defense of the sacred Mazdayasna cow and the opposition to the cow-killing (Behdad, the same: 15). Zakhak, as suggested by Satan, gives two young people to the snake every day to calm his snakes down including the sons of Kaveh Blacksmith:

Each night two youth of high or lowly birth                      Were taken to the palace by the cook,  
Who having slaughtered them took out their brains to feed the snakes and ease the monarch's anguish

Now in the realm were two good high-born persians

Probably, the Harpag's sons who have been the victim of Zahag's snakes are a sign of their lack of support for Harpag / Cyrus and their loyalty to the Astyagh / Mitra.

According to the Shahnameh: the two honorable and decent men from the gens of kings and aristocrats called Armael and Garmayl decided to serve Zahag as his servant so as to save one person from death every day, and they did so and every month, they saved thirty people from death with their own efforts.

The pious Irmal and Karmail                      The prescient. Talking of the lawless Shah,  
Of his retainers and those hideous meals,      Of his retainers and those hideous meals,  
One said: "By cookery we might approach The Shah, and by our wits devise a scheme To rescue one from each pair doomed to death." They went and learned that art. The clever twain  
Became the monarch's cooks and joyed in secret. The time for shedding blood and taking life  
Came, and some murderous minions of the Shah Dragged to the cooks with violence two youths  
And flung them prone. The livers of the cooks Ached, their eyes filled with blood, their hearts with wra

And each glanced at the other as he thought                      of such an outrage by the Shah. They slew  
One of the youths and thought it best to mingle His precious brains with sheep's and spare the other

Firstly, the Armyale and Garmiyale were from the gene of the king and dignified which, in Ferdowsi's lexicon, it meant aristocrats and clerics and elders, and this shows the gap of Iranian nobility with Zahak in the best possible way (Behdad, 39). The Shahnameh also speaks of the struggle of priests (clergymen) against Zakhak:

Wept tears of blood. Among them was a man, Zirak                      Wise, honest, prescient, by name  
—

The chief of althe band of archimages.                      Concerned but fearless he ad-  
dressed Zakhak: —

“Indulge no vapouring for none is born                      kings                      Except to die. There have been  
ere thee

Fit for the throne of power. Both griefs and joys                      Enough they reckoned up yet their  
time came.

If thou wert standing there \_ an iron wall \_                      Yon heaven would grind thee, thou wouldst  
not endure.

As it is clear from the story of the Shahnameh, there is a conspiracy of aristocrats and priests who arrogate people against Zakhak. Because of the struggle of the priests and aristocrats with Zahak, "a group of aristocracy sheds a plot to bring the throne to princes from the family of Jamshid and the leader of this aristocracy is Kawai the Blacksmith, whose heads have been sacrificed for Zahak" (Curtis, 1388: 40). "Armail" and "Garamail" who have entered enthusiastic into the Zaha'it machine in an astute way are the priests. Abu Raigan Biruni writes that after joining Fereydoun, Armabil founded the building of Damavand and he was promoted to to rank of "MesMoghan" meaning the the head of the priests (Safa, 2005: 460). Thus, the words of Armail and Garmiyel "Pak Din" (pure religion) and "Pish Bin" (Predictoner) are the same preachers of the Zarathustra religion who penetrated the Zahak / Mede's system. Since Ferdowsi also pointed out, they entered the Zahak's system with astute and preplan-ning, that is, they were not there at first, and did not have a share in the system. Being pure religion and predictor were the same as being the Mogs or Saints denoting the ones that pre-dicted and interpreted Zahak / Astiag's dream. Thus, Mogs and saints were the enemies of Zahak.

From the fane of fire One shouted:                      “If some wild beasts had been Shah,

We young and old had served him loyally                      but not that foul Zakhak with dragon- shoulders

If we adapt Ferdowsi's narration of Zakhak with the narrative of Herodotus from Astyage, we will see their consistency. We used to say that the structure of Median/ Astyag state was brutal towards the aristocratic and arrogant people. The folks and the liberals were the main-stay of the Azteag, and they did not care for the aristocracy and the nobility that the cruelty of Astyagh in their account of Herodotus was in the form of the feeding of Harpagh's meat and The raven's tail is a mogul. Aristotle Ayatigh arrogated and punished severely (Herodotus, the same.) The 101 aristocratic nature of the clergy could not be linked to the nature of the Democratic kingdom of the Medes (Diakonov, the same,.) 174 Moghan, along with the aristocracy, had established ties with the insurgents and the Persians And this Moghan was respected in the

court of Cyrus II and Cambyses (DiConnow, the same, 175). In the society / the state, the members of the communes and the king were united against the aristocracy and Moghan, and Moghan had a political role as the aristocracy. VANOVA, 1359,. (69) Therefore, the conspiracy of Kaveh Blacksmith and Armilail against Zahak was the same plot of Harpag and Moghan against the Medes and the alliance with the Pars, Kaveh was the same as the Harpag and the Armilail Moghan, and the two traitorous groups were the basis of the power of Fereydoon. Kaveh's blacksmith is also a symbol of the constructor of weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

But what does Ferdowsi say is the Kurds' race from the survivors of Armiland and Garmiyel, Moghan, and what did he mean by thirty people rioting against Zakhak?

To whom they said: "Make shift to hide thyself,      Approach not any dwelling-place of man,  
Thine are the wastes and heights a worthless head      thus fed the serpents, and in every month  
The cook preserved from slaughter thirty youth And when the number reached two hundred  
saved

Provided them, the donors all unknown,      With sheep and goat, and sent them desertward.

Thus sprang the Kurds who know no settled home,      But dwell in woolen tents, and fear not God

As we said, the names of Armila and Grameil are the same mobs and infiltrators in the Zakhak / Astag machine. The rescue of the youth's brain from Zahak snakes is a symbol of the salvation and liberation of the people, from the misleading zahak thoughts, which is the manifestation of Mitra. Because eating the brain of the youth is a symbol of brainwashing and astrakhan of the right path and pure religious ideas. This is the same mislead of pure religious ideas that cause the arrogance of Armila and Grameil of the Magi. "It is full of the pain of the Khalazites as a liar / full of two blood filled with grudge." As we said, zahak is the manifestation and continuity of the same devil / mitra, and demon / mitra is the embodiment of worldly liberation and earthly intellect versus spiritual / metaphysical happiness. Thus, the misleading brain of Zahak, which is expressed in the form of eating the brain, is a symbol of encouraging people to enjoy worldly pleasures and lives, and neglecting religion and metaphysical provisions, is in fact "the abduction of common sense and the spread of lies" (Pirnia, the same : (102) causing K. The Mine-wagons like Armila and Garmiyel, as it caused the Zoroastrian rebellion, is that it is highly regarded as a survivor of Moghan, and today it is in Iranian political culture, from good Kurds, Iranians, and Kurds with knowledge and courage. They say they do not count the Kurds of Al-Fmakh, but the foreign agent and imperialism and the foreign influence ... The survivors of Moghan (Armila and Garmiyel), who are the successors of Kaveh and Moghan against Zakhak Vrydnd the financial aristocracy who Harpagus (Kaveh) joined because of the Zoroastrian ideas / Iran Jatyafth Azgmrahyzhak the teeth, brains were saved from being eaten myths is. They did not support Zakhak's thoughts and supported the logic of Iranian / Zoroastrian intellect, turned Zahak / Astyag back to Fereydoon / Cyrus. Only those who support Iran are considered genuine. Others, as they are now foreign agents and imperialists, were in the past the devil and demon. For Iranians and Ferdowsi, the Kurds are the only ones who have been referring to the logic of aristocracy, shahristanism, and Iranian religion, such as the aristocracy led by Harpag, who was called by the Achaemenid system as the Medes and the Pars's brothers, but the majority of the people of Madad are at all accounted. They did not

come and were constantly suppressed by the massive masses of people appearing to Iranians in the course of the uprising of Geomatia and Frehourt. As Ferdowsi said, only a handful of "Chou gathered," two of them died, "of Kurds joined Iranians, of course, two hundred men and nobles.

In fact, this zahak is rebelling against the oppression of Jamshid, and prevents the mediation of the brain from destroying the Persians who save democracy from the despotism of the di-vine right of the kings, but the Persians, after domination, reversed these myths, and Fereydoon / Kawai The aristocracy again tried to revive class order against Zakhak's horizontal order, the divine right of the kings against a social contract.

Then Ferdowsi, from Zakhak's distraction, says that he is just as asthmatic as Herodotus's dream because of his dream.

Observe God's dealings with Zakhak when he Had forty years to live. One longsome night  
He slumbered in the arms of Arnawaz, And saw a vision of three warriors \_\_\_\_

Boughs of the tree of kings. The youngest one, cypress Who held the middle place, was tall

In face, in armour, and in mien a king fight Zakhak, He rushed with ox-head mace to

Smote him upon the head, stripped off his skin, hands And used it as a rope to bind his

Firm as a rock, placed on his neck a yoke, his Then casting earth and dust upon head

Dragged him before the crowd in shame and anguish Toward Mount Dama-wand. The tyrant writhed:

Thou wouldst have said: "His liver split with fright." He yelled. The palace of the hundred columns

Shook, and the sun-faced ladies left their couches "Shah! While Arnawaz said to him: What was it?

Confide in me; thou wast asleep in peace At home! What saw'st thou? Say what came to thee?

The world is at thy will, beast, div, and man climes watch o'er thee and the seven are thine

A The chief replied: "Oh! may not tell or else. Ye may despair my life. Then Arnawaz:

Be pleased to tell us; we perchance may find A cure is no irremediable

He told them every wit, then said the Fair Neglect it not but seek a remedy

Thy throne's seat is the signet of the age, world	the	Thy famous fortune brighteneth world
Beneath thy famous ring- finger thou hast the world fowls and men		with all its fairies, dives, beasts,
Il 'twixt the moon and fish. What made thee start? swer me.		O, master of the world, Oh! an-
The chief replied: "Oh! may not tell or else. Arnawaz:		Ye may despair my life. Then
Be pleased to tell us; we perchance may find		A cure is no irremediable
He told them every wit, then said the Fair		Neglect it not but seek a remedy
Thy throne's seat is the signet of the age, world	the	Thy famous fortune brighteneth world
Beneath thy famous ring- finger thou hast the world fowls and man		with all its fairies, dives, beasts,
The wisest of each realm __ and tell them all life		See if the hand that threateneth thy
Is that of fairy, div, or man. This known thy foes."		Act vigorously; quail not before
The lady's counsel pleased the Shah.		Night then ...
Was dark as raven's plumes, but when at length hadst said,		The Lamp showed o'er the hills, and thou
Zahak brought archimages shrewed of heart his liver...		And told to them the dream that pierced
They talked together sad at heart tenances		With parched lips and with sallow coun-
They said: "If we tell truly what is fated	lives... We shall be tortured haply lose our	
Among the archiamages was a man	Wise, honest and prescient	
"Indulge no vapouring for none is born	thee	Except to die. There have been kings era
If thou wert standing there __ an iron wal __ wouldst not endure.		Yon heaven would grind thee, thou
One will hereafter take thy throne an fling Faridun,		Thy fortune to the ground. His nam is
And he wil be a royal heaven to earth.		As yet he is not born, thy time of woe



Hath not arrived, but when his honoured mother      Hath borne him he will be a fruitful tree  
...

A mace of steel, will smite thy head therewith      And drag thee from the palace to the street  
In the sequel, Ferdowsi narrates that ultimately Zahak's search for Phi Fyodon remains intact, and Fereydoun is raised by a cow in a far-field farm. It's like the story of Cyrus, who is as far away as Astyag, grew up by a shepherd.

Zahhak appeals to the public and the popular assembly to confirm himself against Fereydoun

Those upright men both young and old subscribed      Their names upon the Dragon's document

Against their wills, because they feared the Shah.      Just then was heard outside the palace-gate

The voice of one that clamoured for redress.      They called him in before the Shah and set him

Ferdowsi has written that the signature and the certificate endorsing Zahhak's goodness by all people, was due to fear and compulsion from Zahhak's behalf.. For Ferdowsi, who Fereydoun signals as the symbol of all goodness and zahak as the symbol of all the filthiness, it is natural that he rejected the Zahhak popularity among the folks and described it as compulsion from the side of Zahhak. At that time, no king has required the approval of the people for his actions so as to oblige and compel them to write a signature. There did not exist public opinion to be important for the autocrats like today. If Zahaek was a tyrant, there was no need for people to confirm his works. As Darius and Cyrus did not need people's approval, and they were not bound to ask people's opinions because they did not need people to confirm them; it was only Ahuramazda's confirmation that was important. Therefore, with all the enmity of Ferdowsi and Iranian myths with Zahak, the nucleus of reality could not have been erased, and Zahhak's popularity and legitimacy are quite clear which required the approval of people from young and old. The popularity and the lack of Zahhak's despotism also is correctly applied to the case of Gamshid's murder, who "called popular gatherings to give their opinions on the killing of Jamshid, indicating that he is not despotic" (Widigren, 137: 90). Ajidahak accepted the people's complaints and promised to consider it ... he fulfilled their needs (Ibn Asir, 1385 : 84). In contrast to Zahaq / Mede's contractual and popular democracy, "the Aryan tribes formed the tyrannical governments in the east and they struggled with the Div-worshippers and Turanians" (Christansen, 1343: 49). The confirmation signatures by the people on the approval of Zahhak / Ajaydak, which, according to Ferdowsi the old and brave signed it, is an affirmation of Zahak's equality and justice. However, the Iranians considered signing such an attestation from the side of elders and aristocrats and they regarded tearing them the action of the folks. In fact, they have shown the story fully in reverse. Conversely, the signing of it was the work of the general public and the liberals, and its tearing down by Kaveh was a symbol of the opposition of the nobility and the elders with it. Thus, the conflict of the two sorts of justice (shared justice with Plato Justice) is quite obvious. If we look at the concept of justice in Avesta and Shahnameh, it all indicates the class hierarchical order, not equality. "In Iran, justice does not mean in the modern sense, but is a divine law" (Saghibfar, 1677: 168) The basic idea for governing in ancient Iran is founded on reinforcing the class boundaries and the homogeneity of the earthly

order with the heavenly or-der, and the Shah's jurisprudence is guarding such a class order (263). Kaveh the justice-seeker is the reviver of class equity against shared equity /justice, which later Darius against Geomati, Anooshiravan versus Mazdakis and Abbasids against the Khartoum and the Islamic Republic versus Kurds' parties restored it again.

Is the goodness and popularity of Zahaak the same as Herodotus and Diakonov talk about it ... regarding the Kings of Mede. "The Medes had gatherings, people's parliaments, and coun-cils of sheikhs" (Herodotus quoted from Diakonov, 180). The Mede state consisted of auton-omous and independent countries (Rezaei, 1384, 204) and the Madian kings were not dicta-tors (in the sese of doing what they desire) (Diakonov, the same, 80), because they relied on the vast masses of free people (Reza'i, the same: 206).

But Kaveh the Smith reacted to the public testimony with an iron sword and turned the earthly legitimacy into a heavenly legitimacy by transferring it to Fereydoun having Fereh-e Izadi (divine glory). He became the mediator of the transfer of democracy to kingdom tyranny. As we said, the word Kaveh is derived from the wor Gav (cow), and the cow symbolizes the sky dome and metaphysical thoughts can not be similar to thoughts to earthly/contractual thoughts in their own essence.

They called him in before the Shah and set him	Amongthe paladins. Zahhak in dudgeon
Said: "tell us who hath wronged thee."	Then the man
Smote on his head before the Shah and cried: __	"O Shah! My name is Kawa and I sue
For justice. Do me right, I come in haste	Accusing thee in bitterness of soul;
An act of justice will enhance thy greatness.	I have had many an outrage at thy hands,
For thou hast stabbed my heart unceasingly	and if the outrages has not thy sanctions
Why hath my son been taken? I had once left	in this world eighteen sons. But one is
Have mercy look on me this once. My liver!	Is ever burning! What is mine offence!
O Shah? Oh say. If I have not offended	Seek not occasion 'gainst the innocent
Regard my plight and save thyself from woe despair	My back is bent with length of years,
Hath seized my heart, my head is all distraught more	My youth hath gone, My children are no
And the children are the nearest kin on earth	Oppresion hath a midde and an end
And pretext ever. Tell me what is thine?	For wronging me and ruining my life.
A smith am I, an inoffensive man,	form And thou art he, and, though of dragon-
Must still do justice in this cause of mine	

Since thou dost rule the seven provinces mine? Why should the toil and hardship all be  
 We have accounts to settle \_\_thou and I\_\_ And all will be aghast if they shall show  
 That this my son hath perished in his turn thine” With all the rest to feed those snakes of  
 The monarch listened and was sore amazed win They set the young man free and strove to  
 The father by fair words, but when Zahhak Bade him subscribe the scroll he read it  
 through  
 And shouted to the ancients of the realm heart” “Confederates of the Div with imipous  
 Ye set your faces helward and have yielded To that man’s biddings I will ot  
 subscribe<  
 Or ever give the Shah another thought” He shouted, rose in fury, rented the scroll  
 And trampled it; then with his noble son In front of him went raving to the street  
 ...  
 When Kawa left the presence of the Shah And still he shouted crying out for aid ...  
 He passed along with spear in his hands exclaiming: “Ye men of name! ye worshippers of God!  
 Who’veer would scape the fetters of Zahhak Let him resort with me to faridun  
 And shadow in his grace. Come ye to him; The ruler here is Ahriman, the Gods’ foe  
 He knew where the place of Faridun was he rebelled and went to him  
 When he arrived, the shouts rose to the sky And he entered the new prince’s court ...  
 When Faridun saw matters thus, and saw the days of Zahhak are coming to end  
 Then Faridun gat ready with dispatch And secrecy dispatched to battle Zahhak... Provide  
 me cunning Smith and let them Make me a massive mace,  
 and they sought the smiths’ bazar in haste, .....  
 They took the work at hand and having wrought a massive mace and took it to the hero  
 It shone as brightly as a noonday sun And Faridun, approving of the work,  
 Bestowed upon the makers raiment, gold, And silver, holding to them beside  
 Bright hopes and promise of advancement, saying; “If I shall lay the dragon in the dust  
 I will not leave the dust upon your hands....”

Here it becomes evident what is meant by blacksmiths and Kave the blacksmiths. In the need for a mace, "having wrought a massive mace and took it to the hero", they rushed into the blacksmith's market ", which means the military blacksmith and the weapon-making workshops. The wagon and iron weapons of Fereydoun and Wakwa are in the aftermath of the Zarathustra's military wars against Mitra. In the Gats, the infidels should also be destroyed with weapons (Yasnah (18.31). Only with Tabarzin (Yasna 31) ... (Yasna, 12). In the eyes of Ahura Mazda, the infidels should be destroyed with weapons (Yasnah (18.31) is also referred to as Zahhak's evil. "Claim that he is devil." As "Ahuramazda converts the gates to The title of a weapon to break the devil "(Zener, the same: (2 6 And Zarathustra kills Mithras with the weapon of war, Fereydoun also destroys Zahak with Kava Blacksmith (military and military class). If Kaveh is a progressive class, why - in the words of Shamloo - the mission To Fereydoun. Kaveh tells Zahak why suffering is just for us

"If seven countries are charming / why suffering and hardship is ours," it reflects the arrogance and dissatisfaction of the aristocracy with the Med and Astyagh system-as we have said earlier that led to the revolt of the Harpagh-led military forces against Zakhak and in support of Cyrus. While Zahak was a despot and bloodthirsty hermit, he was calm in the face of Kaveh's rudeness:

But all the courtiers blessed the Shah and said: — “Illustrious king of earth! May no cold blast

From heaven pass o’er thee on the day of battle.  
countenanced

Why was this insolent Kawa

As though a friend of thine? He tore the scroll,

Refusing to obey thee and is gone

The troops assembled at his gate, his throne to  
go

was lifted to the clouds. The first

Were baggage and provisions for the army  
elephants.

On buffaloes and high-necked

According to Herodotus, as we indicated before - Cyrus addressed the troops (Herodotus, 1387, 99), not the common people and he attacked Astyagh with his army. In contrast to Cyrus and Fereydoun to the troops, Zahak / Atisyat get signatures and supports. Based on the report of Herodotus, Cyrus conquered Hegmatane and Fereydoun also conquer the Gang castle.

According to Hertzfeld, the Herodotus' description of Hegmataneh is the same as the Gan-ges. The same gang that Kexosrow kills Afrasyab in it.

This men called when they used the ancient tongue Gang – I – Dizhukht; to-day ‘tis known among

The Arabs as “the holy place”. The fair

Tall palace of Zahhak was builded there

...

With massive mace, he beated their heads

Set himself upon the enchanter’s throne

Took possession of the royal crown and palace, But though he searched he failed to find Zahak.

Then from the women's bower he brought two idols      Sun-faced, dark-eyed; he had them  
bathed, he purged

The darkness of their minds by teaching them The way of God and made them wholly clean ...

On one side Shahrinaz the cypress-slim                      Upon the other moon-faced Arnawaz ...

Black hair and Sun-faced idols donate Zahak women or girls that Faridun arrested them., as Cyrus - as Katzys says - captures the daughter of Astyagh, his daughter - Amatos. Of course, in the narration of Ferdowsi, Shahrnaz and Ernav, there was the daughter of Jamshid, which Zakhak has captured, which, of course, has been said to acquit Fereydun in conquering Zakhak women. As the acquisition of property from the public and its giving to the aristocracy is defined by Fereydoun and Dariush, the reinstatement of property and just justice has been defined, in the case of Cyrus, in order to stretch it, the legend of Astyagh's grandson, Cyrus, because of its unfoundedness We proved it - to legitimize Cyrus's action. In fact, Fereydoun, like Cyrus, chose one of Zahak's daughters to be married to her husband, from Inzendopressar BehnamSemo and her Sustainer Irandok (Shahrnaz) who was Persian-born Iraj (Rezayi., 38: 1384). This narrative reflects the wives of Amatos, the daughter of Astyagh, By Cyrus, is that he is from the daughter of Zahak Salm and Tour, and from Irandokh Parsi Iraj, is the same as Beriah and Cambyzes, which Bardiya was of material amotism, and Cam-byzes was the same from another Persian Cyrus, Turanian. And Gyvmath and are Frhvrtysh Khbdabh I come back it.

The narration that Ferdowsi brought with Zahak from the beginning of the Fereydoun war is not so much about the narcissus of the Katsias and the Damascus Nicolas and ... - as we have already seen

Roused by that talk Zakhak resolved to act,                      to                      And bade his keen-eyed roadsters  
be saddled.

Now as he neared the city by a byway                      and                      With valiant divs and warriors,  
saw

His palace-roofs and gate he vowed revenge.                      the                      The troops of Faridun re-ceived  
tidings

And flocked to meet him. Leaping from their steeds                      They struggled hand to hand. The  
sitizens,

Such as were warlike, manned the roofs and gates      dened      For Faridun, Zahak had mad-  
them

Bricks from the walls, stones from the roofs, with swords                      And      popular      arrows      in      the  
street, were plied.

In the narration of Katsias and Nicolai the Damascus, against the rebellion of Cyrus, Astyaga attacked Pars in a campaign to punish him, and there was nothing remained to defeat Cyrus that all the people of Pars, including their women, " The sitizens,

such as were warlike, manned the roofs and gates ..." led to the final victory of Cyrus over Astyagh. The final fate of Zahak and Astyag is similar, Cyrus would persecute and torture Astyag, then he regreted his work and exiled him to the Barakanids near Damavand, the site of

the exile of Zahhak. Fereydun tortured and attempted to kill Zahhak, who, after an inspiration, he refused to kill him and he Imprisoned him in a cave in Damavand:

Faridun rushed on him like the wind      And beat his helm in with the ox-head mace "Strike  
not," cried blest Surush, who hurried this      "His time hath not yet come, but bind him  
quished  
Firm as a roch and bear him to some gorge, Where friends and kinsmen will not come to him  
When Faridun heard that he tarried not,      but gat a lasso made of lion's hide  
And bound Zahhak around the arms and waist With bonds that no huge elephant could snap ...  
Thus fortune's favourate bore Zahhak towards Shirkhan and driving him among the  
mountains  
Was purposing to cast him headlong down When came the blest Surush and whispered thus  
The prince in friendly wise: "convey the captive Thus to mount damawand with speed, and  
take,  
No escort, or but what thy safety needeth."      He bore Zahhak as one that rideth post  
And fettered him upon Mount Damawand;      So when new bonds were added to the old,  
And fate had not another ill in store,      The glory of Zahhak became like dust  
And eart was cleansed from his abominations, And bonds alone were left him in the mountains,  
Where Faridun chose out a narrow gorge \_\_\_\_ A chasm which he had marked of viewless depth\_\_\_\_

Therefore, Ajidak / Zahhak was not killed after being arrested by Fereydoun and he was imprisoned in a cave in Damavand with a chain (Safa, 2005, 462). Cyrus also kept Aliya alive, put him in jail after being subjected to astigh And put him in a tight bundle (Katseas, Fotivus, 1379), which is followed by the imprisonment of Ahriman Mitra in the cave by Ahura and his armies.

Let's go back to the story, after which Fereydoun rebuilt Jamshid's class order after breaking Zahhak. Instead of popular legitimacy, it is the basis of legitimacy.

For citizens and soldiers may not seek      A common excellence; this hath his craft And  
that his mace; their sphers are evident      And, if confounded, earth will be so too.

This, in Shamloo's words, shows that the period of the Zahak monarchy, which was right in the midst of the periods of Jamshid and Fereydun, has broken the classes down in society. - According to Hassouri - "Since this period (the period of Zahak, Ghaderi) is completely separate from the divine aspects that have been given to other periods, it must be accepted that it was a humanitarian period, hence, they termed him the so-called Ajidak, which, God forbidden, noone in Iran would rise against the sacred class system. "In Iranian culture, chaos

was conceived as a dragon that God, by killing him, would establish the cosmic order" (Hinels, 153). Those badged as Dragon in the Iranian political intellect, such as Mitra, Zakhak, Geomat and the Mazdakites ... have been those who have challenged the classical / cosmic discipline or hierarchical justice in favor of justice equality and freedom. "In other Persian and Arabic writings, we occasionally encounter another Zakhak which, in Shahnameh, there is not news of him which would obtain real estate and women from the owners and would give it to the public" (Bahar, 1376: 191), and "that kinglike character who has wanted woman and property to be belonging to all was the indication of the indigenous peoples' uprising against the Aryan nobility that has turned into the form of the uprising of the alien king" (the same: 191). In Avesta, Fereydun was called as - Visosurau - which meant the owner of the a lot of houses, that is, he was from the aristocratic family (Darmstar quoted from Pirnia, 1383: 106).

Fereydun revived the Aryan aristocratic order again after defeating Zakhak through destroying Zakhak equity and sharing System:

Men hearkened to the great redoubted Shah	Then all the leading, wealthy citizens
Drew near with gladness bringing offerings	And hertily accepted Faridun,
Who graciously received them and discreetly at large, ...	gave each his rank's due, counselled them
And offered up his prayers and thanks to God, tune's star ..	Then said: "The realm is mine, your fortune's star ..
Is bright, for me alone did God send forth your sakes,	From Mount Alburz by Grace, and for
To set the world free from the Dragon's bane	Blest as we are by Him who giveth good
We ought to walk toward good upon his paths.	As king I may not tarry in one place,
Else would I pass with you a length of days" din	The nobles kissed the ground. Anon the
When Faridun attained his wish, and reigned throne	Supreme on earth, he ordered crown and
According to the usance of old times	Within the palace of the king of kings;
And on the first of Mihr, a blessed day,	Set on his head the royal diadem ...
In those days, apprehensive of no evil,	All men began to tread the path of God,
Abstaining from contention and observing	A feast inaugurated royally.
Then sages sat rejoicing and each held	A ruby goblet, then the wine was bright,
The new Shah's face was bright and all the world began.	Itself was brightened as that month
He dedicated not a single day	To evil in five centuries of sway.

Fereydun overcame Zakhak in the autumn - named as Mehr as the result of Iranian invasions after the October Revolution of Iran, refer to Sept., Spring, or Autumn, and with his dominion, the ultimate victory of good will be possible. Reviving the class order that is identical

to the cosmic order anew, and the 500-year era of his rule for the Persians and the Shahnameh is full of prosperity and security and peace (Curtis, 2009: 42). But Zahak's era in which the class order and the sanctity of tyranny went under question was a hard era for them.

Zahhak sat on the throne a thousand years obeyed by all the world. Through that long time

The customs of the wise were out of vogue, the lusts of madman flourished everywhere,

All virtue was despised, black art esteemed, Right lost to sight, disaster manifest; While  
divs accomplished their fell purpose And no man spoke of unless by stealth.

The ecstasy of Maniacs, Magic and Badness Divan are the same names that was later given by the Iranian kings like Dariush and Anushirvan and ... in address to the opponents of the tyranny of the kingdom and class order. The movements of Zahak / Mede, Geomatha / Farhuratesh, Mazdak and Kharmadynan initiated with the slogan of equality, freedom and negation of the guardian (both terrestrial and metaphysical) influenced by the Mitra, and the autocracies of Fereidoon / Cyrus, Dariush and Anushirvan and Afshin and Taherian, influenced by the state religion And Zoroaster's hierarchy.

"During the period of the Middle Ages or the millennial period of the 6th century BC, the two countries of the Zarathustra were widespread, Zarathushtra was beginning to enter the ruling classes, and the seal was the symbol of equality and brotherhood among the masses of criminals and peasants." (Bahar, "39: 1384). Conflicts That period was at a time when the common lifestyle sought to change in the feudal and capitalist way of wealth accumulation, two of which preceded the history of the encounter between Zahhakyan and Fereidoun, and the date of the conflict between the geomass T and Darius the first ... Fereydoun and his followers overthrew the system of communism in the period of Zahak, or it was intended to establish the former system of communism that had been transformed by the Achaemenids into a capitalist system and feudalism, and acquired individual or family ownership " Razi,. (36: 1382

Therefore, what has been defined under the name of deagon, evil and demon in the Iranian political intellect has another meaning and contrary to the Persian narrative, it is a symbol of goodness. We should analyze it beyond the Iranian good and evil and we should re-evaluated the current values. Goodness of Iran is nothing more than authoritarian despotism, class discipline, and obedience to it, and the riot against authoritarian tyranny and class injustice is defined as evil and badnessl. Zahak and Mitra / Ahriman and ... are beyond the Iranian goodness and evil; therefore, to understand their true nature, we have to remove the foliage and dust out of the most Iran's intellect, and discover the archeology of the Kurds under the dust and the earth of the Iranian identity. To do this, we have to criticize the Iranian political wisdom, which ultimately is the wisdom of Iranian authoritarian despotism. The "Juliet" of the Iranian intellect has always resorted to the tools of power for proving its rightfulness to the extent that power has turned from the instrument to purpose and the truth has become its instrument. If it was a tool for the development of religion and Iranwiy at the beginning of the reign and power , ultimately the goodness religion and Iranwiy became a tool for gaining domination and maintaining power. In contrast, the Kurds / Medes have never tried to prove their legitimacy and ideas through the power, they kept freedom through liberalisation and not by power. For this reason, they preferred freedom in the mountains to slavery in the city and civilization, even they sacrificed the sense of approval and recognition in history by others which is the most important necessity of every nation and they were also deprived from history to preserve their



own freedom and to defend their salvation. They did not subdue to the logic of power to maintain their own prestige and realization of their good religion. Zahak the king tries to prove his truthfulness and legitimacy with documents at the height of his power against the lonely Kave, with a certificate not to bring evidence to establish the power and monarchy of the kingdom. The values of the Kurds were the freedom and the expression of the existence that they sacrificed everything for it. In contrast, the Iranian values were survival, and they grabbed any power and supremacy to maintain their survival. The Kurd's Prometheus received blood every day, but he did not humiliate himself. The Iranian Hermes was through the power and to gain and preserve it, it reached the heaven of the sky. The history has taken the path of error has gone, it is the result of a great error. Those who preferred liberation and salvation became bloodthirsty and humiliated and deleted from the pages of the history, and those who sold liberty and humanity to power and justifications (religion, and Iranwiji, etc.) came to the throne of power. In order to bring history back to its mainstream and to point out its mistakes so that other freedom-trade vendors do not come to power, the throne of power itself should be destroyed to ruin the pillar of the power-hungry people. With the critique of the Iranian political intellect, we have to attack on the root of power, tyranny and ethnic domination of Persians

#### Afrasyab and Turanians

In this section of mythology, we carry out a case study of Keikhosrow and the myths becoming eastern. We will examine the complete correspondance of the Turanians in the next chapter. But before the case study of mythology, we should also mention a significant point: since the collectors of myths were Eastern Iranians or because the myths were gathered during the Sasanians, and the Sasanian enemies at that time assaulted from the east, like the Turks, Turanians were molded on them and the mythology show the direction of the East while the core of Iran's mythological enemies was in the west and the same Medes. We are now addressing the reasons behind eastern becoming of mythologies.

#### - Turanians becoming easterners in mythology:

In his book "Prominent lines of Iran mythology", Pirnia has correctly found out about the eastern becoming of Iran mythological enemies and he has analyzed it. He has rightly pointed out that western affairs have been forgotten up to Alexander's assault because of the fascination of the eastern affairs. There have remained only the Cambyses' military expedition to Egypt, Darius and Khashayar campaign to Europe merely due to their passage of the sea and the attack on Europe. The Shahnameh poems about the East reaches or comes to 20,000 couplets, but the poems regarding the three above-mentioned events do not surpass 1500 couplets all together (Pirnia, 1383: 155). Certainly, Medes has had no effect on the storytelling of the writer; the prominent Median events such as the expulsion of the Assyrian and Scythians have been transmitted to the time of Fereydoun and Keighbad ... (the same: 121). Why did the storytellers forget the West, i.e. the Medes. Maybe since the Medes came to Iran from the Caucasus and they had no relations with the Iranian Aryans that entered the Iranian plateau from Soghd and East. However, the Persians have come from the northeast and were more closely associated with the Eastern Iran (the same: 120). In understanding the myths becoming eastern, Pirnia is right, but in understanding the reasons behind, he is wrong. Medes have not been the Aryan immigrants at all. Pirnia poses this question: "Why have the oriental work of Cyrus and Scythia been given so much prominence and significance but his Western works have not been taken into account?" (the same: 137). The cases are not so simple as Pirnia has presented; the

Medes and Western works of Cyrus have absolutely been given more importance, only their time and places have been changed. The mythological foundation of Iran has been created in contrast to the Medes, only because they were gathered during the Sassanid era, and new Turk and Chinese enemies and ... flocked to the eastern borders of Iran, the concepts of the Turk and ... which was originally created in opposition to the Medes, was molded on the eastern enemies. Therefore, despite the change in the time and place of this mythology, the principle of the actions and its content have been evolved against the West and the native Medes. As Pirnaya himself has pointed out, "the stories were collected in Sassanian-era and geographic names belonged to Sassanid time (ibid. : 156). Most of the collectors of the Iranian mythology were themselves from the eastern parts; thus, to give importance to themselves, they also introduced their enemies as easterners and recorded the honor and the pride of overcoming and beating them under their own name. "The attention to the Eastern affairs shows that the initiative of the eastern people to stories has been more ... Khorasan has always been important, from Selukids to Omavians, from Safarids to Ferdowsi ..." (ibid. : 162-162). In the Sassanid stories, the significance has been given to the Northeast region more and the important events around the West are completely forgotten, there are no traces of the fightings with Rome or it is transitory; there has remained no trace of 27 year war of Khosrow-Parviz with Rome ..., there are no effects of all the wars in the western part of Mesopotamia and Armenia, but there are a lot of the war stories with Hayatella on the East" (ibid.: 70). Pirnaya regarded the Sakaids danger as one of the reasons for the oriental becoming of the myths, "one of the reasons for the stories to alter into the east was was Sakaids and their danger which threatened the existence of Iran; hence, they were not merely coming for conquest but to stay (ibid: 134).

But the logic of Sakaids danger at easternizing the mythologies is not convincing, because at the Sassanian era Sakaids didn't account as a danger. At time of collecting mythologies, at the Sassanian era because of intellectual and political domination of Pers on Medes, importance of Mede dangers had been lessened and Iran had been encountered with new eastern enemies. Enemies that were semi brutal tribes just like the Pers. The other reason is that just like Darius who introduced Magus as Gaumata deliberately and Anushirwan commands that the name of Mazdak shouldn't be mentioned at any of the inscriptions positively or negatively. They deliberately tried to forget and display the Mede worthless at dispensation of the text, to clean culture, identity, and sovereignty of the Mede at historical and mythological memory, to clean the unconscious and make the Mede memory faceless totally, that succeeded in this activity evidently. The Pers tried to forget the name and memory of the Mede magnificence deliberately, because they had been confiscated their land and culture. Memory of the Mede was equal to a faceless and undated Pers. The prerequisite for being Pers and domination on the Mede land, culture, and language was forgetting the Mede at the memory of history and at the memory of the Mede themselves totally. So, for condemning the Mede and omitting them, they changed the name and place of mythologies to depose the Mede from being the original owners of this area and reduce them to a part of Iran. Another theory that we don't have enough facts for reforming it yet is that the origin of mythologies has been addressed to the east. It means just like when we discussed about Jamshid, the Mede mythologies have been against the Pers assailant, but the Pers with confiscating the mythologies, like Nowruz they reversed its meaning and returned it to the Mede, but its eastern orientations have been remained.

What is absolute is that Turanians have no connection with the Turk and Chinese and its content addresses to the Mede, the people who assail to the Iran from northeast are Turanian, Turk, and

Chinese, whereas the ancient Iranian has never been encountered with Chinese at any times and the Turk came to the Iran after the Anoshirvan era. There was enmity between two groups of Iranian and Turanian. From 6th century that the Turk entered to the Central Asia, similarity between these two names caused some people account the Turanian name same as the Turk whereas there was no connection between these two groups. So Turanian has no relation to the Turk and they are more ancient than the Turk. Turanian has never been Turk and has never had any propinquity with them. The heroic and fictional changing of Tu-ranian position into Turkestan was a reflection from secondary broad adaptations that have been done by Sassanian. They accounted Turanian as Turk and Hayavene as Kayviniat. At the Sassanian era because of the Turk attack ... at the Khwaday-Namag book, the book of the Turk's nation, it has been used as an equivalent for the old name of Turanian. Turanian like zahaak and demon have been the reminiscence of Zoroastrians fight with native Medes that later attributed to the Turk. Maybe the memory of fighting with natives somewhat have influ-enced emerging and growing of Iranian national epic and later the Turk took its place.

For example Arjasp was called Xioni as Ammianus Marcellinus the Roman historian has said, Xionites and their king Grumbates at the Shapur II era had a battle. However easternizing of mythologies codified in the Sassanian era, it formed with Zoroaster. We discussed before that Zoroaster was incapable of attracting farmers and cowmen to his religion, so conformed his metaphysical aversion from Medes to people's living trouble, that assailed by badman tribes that were brutal and eastern, against Mede and Mitra. Zoroaster and Zoroastrians for exasperating the commonalty of east against Medes and proponents of Mitra that not only didn't despise the Mede's and the Medes' government and culture and didn't have detriment for them, but also supported from Zahhak/ Mede as we saw at the myth of Jamshid, they en-gaged in adaptation of the Mede actions with the eastern rapacities that were more tangible for people and the base for easternizing Turanian at the mythology arose.

At the Sassanian era because of the deduction of the Mede's power and oblivion of the memory of their magnificence that took place deliberately by Iranians, it didn't include as be-ing so dangerous for existence of Sassanian, non-iranian notions that from its emergence gen-erated for the denial of Mede and Mitra's rite attributed to the Turk and Arab. Azhi Dahhak attributed to Arabs and became Zahhak and Turan attributed to the Turk. Accordingly after the islamic revolution, and suppression and elimination of the political Kurd forces and their oblivion, the notion of bogie that first used to adress the Kurd parties, attributed to the U.S.A. Although as I mentioned we don't have enough scientific facilities for understanding that mythology have been Mede and then conquered by the Pers magus, the mythology scrib-ers but, it is clear that the major part of mythology and Shahnameh seized from the Mede, Mitra Yashts folkish Kurds that I discussed about it at the next chapters by unfortunately we haven't done any scientific research to know about the amount of seizure. But if the origin of the mythology has been Mede or Kurdish that has been seized and Iranian connotation has been given to it. In this way, the other mythology basically has been the same east that has been happened from the Mede's conflict with the Iranian emigrants at the east of Madestan, the the Pers with the seizure of the Mede's mythology, that was the other one itself, they re-turned it to the Mede, but they didn't have the perception of changing its direction from east to west.

Keikhosro / Cyrus, Turan / Mede

The basic subject of Shahname is the presentment of battles between Iran and Turan. The Maj parts of Shahnamh is justification and legitimacy of the kings and the loyalty of vassalages to the king, and the eternal struggle between good and bad that reflected in the battle between Iran and Turan. Shahnameh that is a sample of Iranian cognizance and science and it's like Quran for the Arab people, starts with the Iranians battle with goblins, devil, and Zahhak, then continues with the battle of Turanians. In fact, the entire struggle and the base of Iranian political ration represented in Avesta revolves around the axes of fighting with the Kurds (Dive, Dimon, Zahhak and the Toranians). "At Avesta, Tur people are Div-worshippers and Dimons" (Saghian,1381: 8) which we expressed who Div-worshippers and Dimons were our thoughts. In reality, the connection between Iran and Turan was not related to the issue of ethnicity or contradiction of Iran with Turks or Barbars, but it was connected to the issue of cultural differences (Yaghob, Saghian, the same: 26). The cultural difference that we comprehensively talked about before is the contrast between the two attitudes toward existence and human, i.e. the spiritual / metaphysical view of Iranians in opposition to the earthly / bodily perspective of the Medes and the struggle between Zoroaster and Mithra. "What separated Iran and Turan from each other was neither ethnic difference or language but it was religion that differentiated them" (Gombelof, quoted from Reza, 1386: 557). As Gombolof has stated the main reason for the contrast between Iran and Turan is religious conflict and we provided many evidences that the Iranians religious conflict has been with "the other" of Zoroaster, that is, Medes and their Mithraism ritual. "Zoroaster was the preacher of Ahoramazd against worshipping the Divs; nonetheless, the new religion was not accepted everywhere and that group of Aryans who remained faithful to their ancient religion were called Turanians and the followers of Zoroasterism were termed as Iranians (Gombolof, the same, 557). However, the presupposition of being Aryans has faced many challenges and the ancient religion was Medi-an Mithraism and the new religion has been Zoroasterianism which we will analyse more in the following chapter with regard to Rostanm and Isfandiar. Another point which should be attended to was that it is true that the struggle was under the framework of religious concepts and it was the uprising of Zoroaster religion against Mithra, but it was not restricted to religion. The main cause behind such a victory of Iran/ Mazdayasnan over Turan/Divesnan was the political victory of Pers over the Medes through Pers support of Zoroaster. Following we will consider the instance of Kianians.

There are various views about Kayanids and their relation to the Achaemenid, some researchers, such as Hertel and Herzfeld and largely Noldeke believed both Kayanids and Achaemenids to be the same and others such as Christensen, and Henning, disagreed and regarded Kayanids as the Eastern kings. Here, we do not enter into such discussions regarding Kayanids and we will postpone the correspondence between them to the coming chapters. Here, we will consider Keykhosraw and Afrasiab and their correspondence with Cyrus and Astiag.

The comparison of Kaykhosraw's and Cyrus' lives and actions will connote their similarities. Even if Kaykhosraw had not been Cyrus and he had had roots in older legends, his life would have been molded on Cyrus later. However, what is likely is that Kaykhosraw has been constructed based on Cyrus' life. The mothers of them both were alien: "Kaykhosraw's mother was Turanian and Cyrus' mom was Median. Both were grown up away from their father, Kaykhosraw in Turan and Cyrus in Mede. Kaykhosraw beated his grandfather, Afrasiab and Cyrus removed his grandfather, Astiag".

After the death of Siywash, Afrasyab orders that Kai Khosrow and her mother be expelled from the encircle to lose his generation. Astiag, too, gives his daughter to Kambodia in order not to be a noble. Piran-e Waisa called the shepherds and gave Khosrow to them. Harpag also gave Cyrus to the shepherds ... when he was 10 years old, he became so rude and insolent that the shepherds returned him to Harpag and Astiag. Piran-e Waisa took care of the group, and Afrasiab would like Khosrow and ordered Farangis to take care of him. Loving Cyrus, Astiag also took him and her mother to the royal court. After killing Afrasiab in the east, Kai Khosrow is taken by a great storm and he is lost (Rzai, 1384: 63). Cyrus was also killed and disappeared in a mysterious way in the east. "The alliance of Kai Khosrow with heros – the local rulers – against Turanian Afrasiab is the reflection of Cyrus's alliance with Persian aristocrats against Mede" (Pirnia, 1383, 132). Herodotus's narration is comparable with Iranian heroic story: The alien king (Astiag – Afrasiab) ordered the Persian prince to kill his nephew (Mundana – Farangis), the boy was saved and he was brought up among the shepherds and he later overcame his grandfather. Perhaps Harpagos can be compared with Piran, in the original myth also a bitch (female dog) milked Ardashir" (Noldeka, 1537, 17). Both of these events corresponds with Ajidahak, "Aryan tribes formed despotic governments in the east and they struggled with Div-worshippers and Turanians, Hosrawa – Kai Khosrow – triumphed over Ferangisin in the war. This war – Kaosraw with ferangisin – had an unforgettable impact on people's minds in which the userper turned into Zahak" (Kristensen, 1343: 17). The death of both of them, Cyrus and Kai Khosrow is mysterious... both are the great kings ... Cyrus was forgotten and his works not given to Kai Kosrow ... this point that there was no trace of Kai

Khosrow in west while all Cyrus' actions are carried out in the west is due to the fact that storytellers have bolded their interest share of the east ..." (Pirnia, the same, 132- 133). Richard Frai have considered Cyrus as Kai Khosrow and the person who wanted to kill Cyrus in his childhood time as Ferangerisian called Afrasiab in Shahname and the Greek historians have called him as Astiag" (Mansori, 1372, 170 – 171).

In verse (Yasht) 5, "Kai Khosrow - Koy Heoserwa- is the one uniting the cities of the Iranian kingdom who sacrificed in the Chichest lake for Anahita" (Rizai, 1384,:59). Who has formed and the kingdom and united the cities other than Cyrus? Kristensen put forward one reason for rejecting Achamanid being of the Kyanians: Koy was among the titles of eastern Iranians" (Kristensen, 1343: 6) while the word kingdom has been utilized for Kai Khosrow which was a western concept (Western Iran / Persia) and was specific to the dictionary of the Achaemenid kings that has been used in mythology about Kay Khosrow Kayani, who is the one uniting the kingdom. The use of the term "kingdom" is a historical concept related to Achamanids and referring to Kay Khosrow Kayani indicates their common roots. Thus, the lack of the word "koy" regarding Achamanid kings does not signify that they are not the same as many other concepts about Achamanid kings has remained unknown in the view of Greek authors such as temples which for years the historians rejected their existence in Persia based on Greek historians until the new archaeological discoveries proved their existence there. Further, PiranWaisa is a completely Median/Mithraism concept. Piran is the plural of Pir is the final stage of the seven stage of Mithraism/Contract meaning the chief of a tribe or village, i.e. a chief or king selected through contract.

The The Kianians are divided into two groups, from KaiGhobad, who brought the capital to Pers, to Kai Khosrow, from Lohrasb to Dara or Darius III. The Achaemenids are also divided

into two categories , from Cyrus the first , who migrated to Persia to Cyrus the Great , then to the other Per-sian dynasty from Arsham and Gashtasib to Darius the Third, in which Arsham is the same as Lohrasib (Pirnia, 1383: 142). Arsham was not a king like Lohrasib; his children became king. "There is no name of Lohrasib in Avesta and it seems that he had not the title of the king in the old history , and today 's stories about his throne are later scandal-ous forms from his story to fill the gap between Kai Khosrow and Goshtasib (Re-zai, 1384:64). as Darius counted himself, his father, and grandfather, Arsham and Aryarmena who were not kings, from the generation of the kings to obtain legitimacy and to justify the lands he usurped. In kiyanian legends, Kai Ghobad repaced the ancestors of Cyrus that trans-ferred the capital from the north to Pers; hence, the capital is moved from Achamanids to Pers in the history" (Pirnia, 1383:120).

After marrying Farangis, Afrasiab's daughter, Siawash built GangDij. The castle of GangDij was at the beginning on the top of kingdom court and Kaikhosrow brought it down to earth. There had seven walls: golden and silver, and iron, and brass, and ... " (Safa, 1384: 513-514). Kai Khosrow was born at GangDij and before the advent of Zoroaster he was aware about Mazda religion and practiced it, he destroyed pagoda of wrong-religion followers at Chichist lake. After the devastation of the pagoda, he erected AzerGisb and the holy fires on the Iranian and Turanian border ... " (Safa, 518-519). Azargosap or Kai Khosrow fernances are the same fire-temples that Bouys and Hints have mentioned them.

Rawlison , Jackson and Yosti " They call Azergoshnasab as the same Takht- e Soleiman but Marakorat ( says ) Ganjak or Shys - Azergoshnasab - is the summer residence of KhosrowParwiz and and Takht- e Soleiman is another place and Shys should be in the direction to Maragha; thus, it can be not Takht- e Soleiman but Sabalan, Ardabil and Maragha ..." (kahlan, 1375: 30-31). In any case, Chichest is the same Urmia, and, Azergoshnasab is the sacred fire temple of Zoroasterian, whose base has been the land of the Medes. Mostawfi in Nezhatol-al Gholob, " related the abode of Takht- e Soleiman with the myth of Kai Khosrow which ... is connected to the Azergoshansab fire tempe" (Mostawfi quoting Minoriski, 1378; 32). Therefore, it was not the Tauranians in the East but the Medes. The connotation of "GangDij was at the beginning on the top of kingdom court and Kaikhosrow brought it down to earth" with seven colorful walls is the same Hegmatana which Herodutos described as having sevenscolorful walls as an indication of its occupation by Cyrus and the transformation of power from the Pers to the Medes. Up to the time it was the capital of the Medes, it was the place of

Divs, but when it became Cyrus's capital, it became famous as the sacred place and fire-place. This saying that "Kai Khosrow killed a dragon in the middle of Pers and Isfahan, it is referring failure of the Medes by Cyrus" (Pirnia, 1383, 141). In Yasht 5, chapter 50, there is the incident of Kai Khosrow's triumph over Afrasiab in Chichest -Urmia - Lake. One who imprisoned Farangis was Heom, one of the gods (Yasna. 7/11). Faraidon took the jailed Iblis – Zahak - with the help of an angel to the mount Alborz (Kirtis,1388: 42. In the same way that Persios killed Medosa with the help of the god of Hermis and Atena temple, Afrasiab like Zahak. Became aware of his killing at the hand of his nephew through the words of as-trologers and zoroastrian priests (Safa, 1384: 250). Compare this with the Herodutos narration about the Astiag's dream killed by his nephew.

That Afrasiab rescued the Iranians from the evil of Zangyab (Yasht, 93/19) is possibly meant Sargon the second, the Assyrian King who slagughtered the Medes to gain mastery ( Kahlan,

1375, 128 ). In assaulting Pers, Cyrus was forced him to accept Sargon's rule, and gave one of the his son as hostage to him also this point that Afrasyab pushed out Zangyab from Iran Iand is referring to the destruction of Ashur Howakhshatra. After been defeated, Afrasyab took refuge in a cave on the top of a mountain near Barda'. The cave is a familiar indication of Mithra.

...سرکوه خارا هوارا به سود به نزدیک بردع یکی غار بود

به غار اندرون جای لالای ساخت      خورش برد و از بیم جان جای ساخت

In the same mountain, a pious man, who was austering and painstaking in a corner, heard his whines.

ز غارش یکی ناله آمد بگوش پرستش همیکرد پشمنه پوش

The man clad in wool, a symbol of mysticism, captured Afrasiab . its symbolic meaning is the transition from the culture of the Median tragedy to mystical Persian culture . It is a surrender of the Mithraism tragedy to the Zoroastrian mysticism that I will return to it later .

Out of the high sighs of Afrasiab captured in the cave, Hum Let him go and hide in the lake (Kahlan, 1375: 38). Godarz tortured Gersiwez, his brother, Afrasiab hearing his brother's cries came out of the water and fell into Godarz's lasso. Kai Khosrow killed Gersiwez (Kristensen, 1343: 170). Compare it with Katyas's narration about Astiag: After been defeated in Ekbatan, Cyrus began to torture Astiag's daughter and her children, and Astiag was taken as a prisoner to release her kins" (Katias, quoting from Diakonof, the same, 390).

Koy Heoserwa \_Kai Khosrow – having Fara- e Kiani (Yasht 19/73 – 77) killed Turanian Feragersin (Yasht 10/19). The Turanian traitor was in an underground castle (Yasht 5/14), he lived in Sols Mianin in the protection of an iron wall (Yasna 7/11). The underground castle of Afrasiab being in the protection of an iron wall is reminding us of Mithraism underground caves, on the one hand, and iron wall or fortification is an indication of Kave's iron mace against Zahhak, on the other hand. Afrasiab lived on the middle floor under the ground named "HanKana" , " ( Safa , the same, 618 ). After his defeat, Afrasiab took refuge in a cave near "Barda". Afrasiab's regiment , which was an underground evil palace in the cave , was became a cave in Shahnama (Kahlan, 1375: 36 – 37). A fortification of iron is a reminder of the iron fetters in which Mithra and zahhak were trapped under the ground ( cave ), and it is also reminding us of Kave the blacksmith against Zahhak and the iron dam of Zolgharnain against Gog and Magog. Thus , not only do Afrasiab and Turanians belong to the Medes, but also in religious and symbolic aspects; the cave and the underground vault of Afrasiab is a reflection of Mithra / Ahriman (Demon) and Zahhak. In Avesta , the Turanian tribes are Div-worshippers and Ahriman ( Simadin Of, 1381:8 .) and the original reason for wars with Irani-ans was religious conflicts that the Iranians accepted Zoroastrianism but Turanians were Di-vasnians (the same, 6) which we stated before that what Zoroastrians meant by Ahriman and Divworshipper were Medes/Kurds.

## Chapter Four

The Establishment of Iranian Political Ration against the Uprising of the Median Identity  
(Dariush and Geomata)



## Introduction

As we have noted in the preceding chapters, contrary to the prevailing but baseless view, the Medes accepted the yoke of the Achaemenid after a military defeat despite their own volition and with the great resistance "of all the people including the old and the young" after a three-year war" ( Herodites, 1387: 101). Dissatisfied with their defeat from the Persians and their domination, they rioted in the time of Cambodius and Darius to escape the domination of the Persians and restore their greatness along with Geomata, Ferawartish and ChiserTokhma (the same, 102). "The view that Medes were considered as the dominant people the same as Achamenids is not correct at all. Even if there was such a thing, it was confined to the nobility, which Cyrus was able to overcome the Medes through their treachery " ( Aliyev, 2009: 424). While some Medes such as Harpag have remained in military sensitive posts under the reign of Cyrus , the majority of the Medes were loyal to the continuity of the Mede Empire even in a weak way and they raised their disagreements and complaints in the time of crisis (Genito, 2005 ; 317 ). "Along with the conquest of Mede by Cyrus, Ekbatan was plundered, some Medes became slaves and as an occupied land, the people had to pay fines; even though Cyrus kept the Mede kingdom superficially but he appointed a Persian Satrapi there" ( Diakonof, 1388: 390). Even the Mede nobility , who had betrayed the Mede in favor of Cyrus, was removed and destroyed in the days of the reign of Darius I and Xerxes , and most important positions were not occupied by the Persians chiefs , especially the people from the Seven Persian families , and the formal and false manifestations of the unification of the two Kingdoms of the Mede and Persia was no longer observed after the time of Darius" ( the same: 391)1.

The great Achaemenid empire was composed of numerous tribes and nations that they had once experienced the heyday of their own power. They went hardly under the yoke of the Achaemenid and they were ready to get rid of foreign domination and rule at the right time (Aliyev, 1992, 423). That the rebellious kings against the Persians domination were the remnants of the reign of the kingdom dynasties like: Atina in Ilam, Nilintobel in Babylon, whose ancestors had been removed from the monarchy by Cyrus the Achaemenid shows the legitimacy of the kings deposed by Cyrus and the lack of Cyrus' legitimacy among the people. Therefore, the uprising kings traced their lineage back to the kingdom dynasties to fulfil people's satisfaction against Iranian ruling.

“When the Iranian government was not yet rescued from tribal relations in twenty years, it turned into one of the largest empires of the world, hence it did not go through the natural course of the rest of the world countries”. (Dandamaif, 1386, 223-224). There was still a strong tribal and ethnic relations inside it .the waging authoritarian wars and the pouring of great wealth into the country at Cyrus tim delayed or barred the struggle that would likely to be fought between the government and the aristocracy (Aliyev, 1388: 502). The Iranian Empire had no internal convergence and natural transformation . Small and large units were occasionally associated with one another, and the relationship and link of these units had direct links with the victory or the failure of any of the kings ( the same: 423). There exists also more emphasis on political subordination and dominance to get tribute than the cooperation of tribes with each other (Baryan, 1380; 272). Daruishi: “(If you notice that) there were so many ethnithities that Daruishi ruled over them ....., you know that the Persian warrior spear has gone far away”. Due to the lack of unity and cooperation among the nations under the subordination of Persians, he clearly refers to the uprising of all nations against the Persian domination after Cambodja left Iran in the inscriptions and in the time of weakening his power. When Cambodia arrived in Egypt , the people became traitors, lying increased among the people, among the Persians, the Medians and other people ... people inclined towards the evil ...; thus, a man or a Mog called Geomata rioted ... all the people became rioters against Cambodia and went toward him and he (Geomata) became the king" (Bisotun , DB, article 1& 10). Due to the public discontent with the Achaemenids, Geomata easily succeeded to unite and bring the people of all the tribal areas under his allegiance, which in July 522, he was the unrival king without a royal partner (Diakonof, 1388: 392). The relations of tribes under the Persian / Achaemenid Empir with the ruling Persian tribe was external and on the basis of hegemony and governmental resources as well as it had no cultural basis. For this reason, with the vacuum of central power such as going Cambodia to Egypt, the Medes who were under the domination of the Persians tried to free themselves and all the non-Persian tribes upraised in the time of the restoration of the Persians ruling by Darius. After killing Geomata, Darius, encountering continual rebellion of non-Persian tribes led by the Medes, tried to stabilize his authority after a military crackdown . The Cyrus and Zoroaster period was the development of the Persian empire , but the period of Darius and Moges was the duration of the the em-pire's establishment armed with Mazdayasna ideology against “the other” of Divesna . The military wars with Geomata, Chiserma and Ferawartish was completed with Mazdayasna's hegemonic battle with

Divasna. As Darius established Cyrus' invasions, the Magis , too , at-tempted to fix the religion of Zoroastrianism. The final Iranian political reason was later for-mulated in the Sassanian period after the suppression of the movement of Median Mazdak, its outline was originally processed at Darius 's time in the Bisotun inscription .

Who is Gaumates?

At the end of 524 or at the beginning of 523 B.C, Cambodia, in time of campaigns to Habash faced failure and he returned to Memphis, the administrative capital of Egypt and he re-pressed the rebellion that had been erected in Egypt against the Government of Iran. Soon in 522 in March, he received news that his brother, Bardia, had rebelled in Iran and he became a king . He left for Persia, but he did not find opportunity to reclaim the throne, and he died in the middle of the way . Darius killed the false Bardia and took control of the government

(Dandamaif, 1386: 159). It is the summary of the story that has occupied the scholars' minds for many centuries. Various theories have been expressed in this case. We have already<sup>2</sup> stated the Median being of the Geomata's uprising and we do not need to repeat it. Here, it is only to be noted that most ancient and modern historians believed that Geomata became the king to restore the glory and the sovereignty of the Medes and he removed the Persians' sovereignty over the Medes (Dandamaif, 1388: 171). One of the strong documents in proving the Median being of Geomata uprising was the last will of Cambodia to Persian elites while returning from Egypt: Cambodia swore to the Persians that they must never let the superiority and sovereignty transfer to the Medes, If they took control of the kingdom through force, you must take it out from them through power and if with trickery, you take it from them through trickery (III, 65). Gaberyas, one of the Cambodia's companies expressed regret for the Persians going under the dominations of the Medes (Her, III, 72) (Hintis, 1386, 202). When Cambodia announced this will in return from Egypt to Persians, the revolts of Ferawartish and Chiserma and other nations have not started. These uprisings happened after killing Geomata and repressing his revolt and Darius' sitting on the throne after September 29th, 522 B.C (Dandamaif, the same, 191).

Cambodia's will was at the time of Geomata's uprising or false Bardia. Therefore, it was quite clear for Cambodia and the Persians that it was a Median uprising against the Persians, which they advised returning dominance and sovereignty from the Medes to Persians. Further, even though the Ilamian and Persian narration about Geomata's revolt describes him as a Moge<sup>3</sup>, but the Babylonian version calls him *lu-kur ma-da (a-a)*, which means the Median man (Yam Ochi, 1390:193).

There have been presented various views on the Geomata<sup>4</sup>. Without re-engaging myself in all sorts of views, I will present my own views based on different sources. We have access to four narrations according to four views: Bistoon inscription, Herodotus, Justin and Katzias. All four sources agree that Cambodia secretly killed his brother, Bardia, on his army campaign to Egypt because he feared that he may usurp the royal throne (Diakonov, 1388, 392). Unlike Darius' inscription, Herodotus considered the death of Bardia, whom he called "Samerdis" as occurring after Cambodia's journey to Egypt whom he was brought back to Iran and was killed by Parkasasb, Cambodia's confidant. (Wishoufer, 1389:43). Bistoon inscription mentioned only on Moge Geomata who "Trogyamia" is also aware of his existence, and calls him "Geomta" (Diykonov, the same). "Trogyamia" and "Herodotus" informed us of the conspiracy of two Moges. Herodotus introduced the name of the Moge as "PetiZeits" who enthroned his brother, Samerdis – Herodotus called Bardia as Samerdis – that was similar to the king's brothers. Trogyamia informed us of two Moges: Gomtes and Aropasts that Gomtes killed Cambodia's brother – Margis- Mardia and enthroned Aropastes (Wishoufer, the same: 44). But Katzias who is the only Greek historian who is aware of the official date of the killing of Cyrus' son like Bistoon inscription only mentioned the name of one Moge (Dandamaif, 1386: 163). Therefore, Herodotus and Trogyamia have made mistakes, and they have regarded the words that Persians have known as the title and they have made non-historical specific people out of them, in fact, only a rebel leader has existed and he has been Geomata (Wishoufer, the same, 7).

Today some historians, such as Omsted, Boyce, and Winkler, have casted doubts about the accuracy of the inscriptions of ancient historians, and they believed Bardia not to be a false but as a real Bardia that Darius has introduced him as false just to justify his confiscation of the power. However, as most ancient and modern historians, and we already proved, this theory is

untenable. The rebellious person has been not the real Bardia but Median Geomatan that in order to stabilize his power he had first introduced himself as Bardia. Though, the real Bardia, based on Katiaz narration and proven by Hertsfeld, was married to his sister, the granddaughter of the last king of the Mede, Astiag, who Cyrus, with the murder of his son - in - law and taking his daughter, married to Bardia's mother.

Based on Katias' narration, "Amiteda", tonyaksart's mother – Katias knows Bardia with this name – was Astiag's daughter and Simitama's woman. Cyrus killed Simitam and married Amitida that Bardia – Toniaksart - was born of this woman (Katsias, Fotuius, 1379: 47). However, Bistoon inscription considers Cambodia and Bardia as from the same father and mother " Cambodia had a brother named Bardia he was from the same father and mother as Cambodia .... Thus Cambodia killed this bardia ..... (Bistoon inscription, DB, Par 10). Diakonov correctly indicated that Darius emphasis on the brotherhood of Cambodia and Bardia in the inscription has been due to this fact that there has been another belief regarding their brotherhood (Diakonov quoting from Nandamaif, 1386: 213). In other words, Darius emphasis on the brotherhood of Cambodia and Bardia was because of this fact that Bardia has not been real Cambodia's brother. Darius' emphasis on killing Cambodia's real brother by him, as Asrowa has stated, was the result of of Daruis' enmity with Cambodia (the same: 212). Therefore, the story probably goes in this way that Cyrus married with Astiag's daughter named Amitida/Amitis having a daughter, Atosa and a son called Bardia – a Median name meaning high - after killing her husband. Thus, Amitis became Cyrus' wife after he executed his husband ((Hertsfield quoted from Henning, Fati, 1364: 28). It is highly likely that Bardia and Atosa were astiag's nephew and niece. The reason beyond Bardia's killing by Cambodia has been his Median being. If otherwise, Cambodia , who , according to the traditions as the older brother and chosen by the former king ( Cyrus the great), had no reason to fear Bardia to kill him. it is probably that there existed a conspiracy to restore the power to the Medes by Amitis, Bardia and Atosa in colleague with Geomata. Because of the murder of Amitis' hus-band and his father by Cyrus and the killing of Atosa's father and his only brother, Bardia by Cambodia, and most of all, because of being Median, they hated Cambodia and Persians. Af-ter Bardia's death whom Katias calls Tati Eksark, Amotis becoming aware of the event curs-ed Cambodia and committed suicide with poison (katsias, Fotuis, 1379:48). Later,the leader-ship of the plan has fallen on the shoulders of Geomata, an influential Median figure at the court - possibly possessing ranks with the help of Bardia and his mother. Acadmisin Astrove has also pointed to the role of Atosa in the revolt of the people towards Cambodia (Estrove quoting Aliove, 1388,:504). At the beginning of his activity, Geomata had united with Atosa who felt hostile to Cambodia - that his not going to Egypt along with Cambodia was a reason for the authenticity of this claim (Aliof: the same). Atosa was discontented with Cambodia, for he left and ignored her in Persia and took her sister as queen with himself. Therefore, Atosa contributed to the promotion of Bardia (Winkler, 1379:48). Thus, there has been a plot by Atosa in order to restore the power to the Mede in which Cambodia has foiled the plot out of his suspicions through killing Bardia. Nevertheless, the plan of reviving the Mede by Bar-dia's sister and his mother would continue and in the time of Cambodia's journey Geomata called himself Bardia to give legitimacy to himself.

Katias pointed out that cyrus, at the time of his death, set Tati Iksark Bardia - as the gover-nor

(Satrap) of several eastern states, including Bactria and Parthia. But Gezenfon has known Bardia as the Satrap of the Medes and Armenia. Istrowa clearly points out that at the time of the seizure of the government by Darius, the Satrap of Bactria has been Dadarshish and the satrap of Parthia and the Hirkani (Caspian) has been Gishtaseb

Therefore, Gezenfon's word is more correct

to identify Bardia as the Satrap of the Medes (Istrowa quoting from Dandamaif, the same 166). Thus, Cyrus has probably chosen Bardia, being Median from his mother's side and based on Katias' word his Median being ruler was all around, as the Satrap of the Medes because of the prevention of the Medes' uprising. Using the facilities of a Satrap, with the help of his mother and sister, and a handful of the Medes, attempted to revive the Medes' authority and to destroy the Iranian ruling, that the plot was exposed by a Mage, from among the same Mages as in alliance with the aristocracy against Astiag, whose name has been termed as Isfandadat by Katias. In order to reveal his plan, Sifand - based on Katias' view - came to Cambodia and he accused Tati Iksart - Bardia - near Cambodia. By the edict of Cambodia, they killed Tati Iksart - Bardia with drinking the blood of bulls<sup>5</sup> (the old pattern of killing, like drowning Zahhak with the blood of the cow by Faridun), and Cambodia appointed Sefand, who has had a great likeness to Tati Iksart as the Satrap of Media (Katias quoting from Dan-damaif, the same: 164). Probably because of his significant devotion to Cambodia in exposing Bardia's plan, Cambodia gave Mage Sefanderatas the responsibility of the whole court in his absence. The people around Bardia, owing to the loss of the plan and the murder of Bardia, killed Mage Isfandiat or the false Bardia after the departure of Cambodia and Geomata introduced himself as Bardia or the false Bardia of Cambodia. Because the murder of Bardia was hidden by the orders of Cambodia, and Geomata utilized the best out of this concealment, he hid the murder of the Mage Isfandiat, and he himself replaced him and through introducing himself under the Bardia's name "I am the son of Cyrus, Cambodia's brother" (Bis-ton, DB, part 11), he acquired legitimacy in Media as according to Medes being of Bardia; thus, he prevented the revolt of the Persians and the court members and established his power through introducing himself as the son of Cyrus

#### The Essence of Gaumata's uprising

There are various theories about the Geomata's rebellion and the nature of his uprising; Hertel, Hertsfield, Hints and ... know it as the Median Mage uprising against the dominance of Zoroastrianism in Persia and they emphasize on the religious aspects of the uprising. Even though, Diakonov points out the social and tribal - national aspects of the uprising; however, people like Jung describes this as the struggle of religious scholars more. Althaim, Wischofer along with Hertsfield, Winkler and Konik stressed on the social and communist aspects of Geomata and consider it as the descendant of Mazdak. Hertsfield, from one side, considers it from the national side as the Median revolt, and on the other hand, he regards it as the social aspect of Persian anti - feudalism and also against Zoroastrianism. His mistake is that he considers Geomata as the Mage and the Mages as the Median. Messina, Dandamaif, Marquardt and ... know Geomata as a prejudiced Zoroastrian against Zoroastrian religion and the Persian folk religion, and, like the first group, he emphasizes the religious aspect of the uprising like the first group except that, in contrast to Hertsfield and Hertel, they regard Geomata the Mage rather than the Zoroastrian, but as an orthodox Zoroastrian against deviations. Dandamaif put

emphasis on the centralizing activities of, too. This point that Dandamaif and Wishofer regard Mages as Zoroastrianism is right but this issue that if they consider Geomata as Mage and Zoroastrianism is merely false. Talstof and Astove who considered the ruined shrines at the hands of Geomata as the fire-temple are right. This matter that Oper and Lorenman know Geomata as the enemy of Zoroaster and the rituals and the destroyed temples as Zoroastrianism is right but this subject that they know him as Mage is wrong. Marquardt ... all stressed on the political/courtial aspect of the revolt. This point that Marquardt knows Mages as Zoroastrianism is right but regarding him as Zoroastrian Mage is wrong. Mery Bois, Beryan, Omsted and ... regard it as political/ courtial war among Persians themselves. Marquardt, Dandama, and Mary Bowe, who are correctly questioning Mage-killing theory, are right, but Dandamaif and Bois who know the

Geomata as the real Bardia is wrong. Perashak, Ishpigil, Konic and ... emphasized on the nationalism/ Median feature of the uprising against the Persian authority. This issue that Henning and Rawlinson put stress on the popular aspect of Geomata's uprising is correct but this point that they know it to be under Zoroaster's influence is incorrect. This issue that Kristensen regarded Geomata's revolt as the revival of Median power is true but this subject that he considered it as the Median Mages' activity is false. Similar to the story of Mavlavi's elephant, there is a trace of truth in each view but they have not found out about the totality of Geomata's uprising. As Ishpigil, dankar, Hertsfield, Aliof, Herdoutes and Perashk have said, the Geomata's uprising has been the revolt of Median nation against the domination of Persians and the yoke of Iranians. Further, As Wishofer, Althaim, ishtill, Winker and Hertsfield have said, it has been along with socialist activities against aristocracy and as Hertil and Hertsfield have said, it has been against Zoroastrianism and Iranian religion. However, in contrast to their ideas, Geomata has not been neither the Mage nor the Mages as being the Median and based on Masina's idea Mages has not been a Median tribe but a Persian one. Unlike Masina and Dandamaif's view, Gomma was not a Zoroastrianist but a Mithraist and an anti-Zoroastrianist. According to Rawlinson, Yarashk and Darmster, it has been the native people's uprising against the aristocracy of the Aryans, because the Medians were the natives and the Iranians were the Aryan migrants. Nonetheless, many western historians, that paid attention to the social aspect of Geomata, have usually given this fight a tribal form, and they know it as a dispute between the Medes and Persians (Dandamayf, *ibid.* 291). They have considered Geomata's uprising as the struggle between non-Aryan nations against Aryan nations (Prasek, 1906, 281). In general, it should be said that all theorists have taken only one dimension of the struggle into account. Geomata's struggle, from one side, was a national and religious one (Kolness in Yung, 1390: 135) and on the other hand, it was a class and social struggle. Before beginning, I should indicate that most of the analyses regarding Geomata's uprising and Daruis' repression have rooted in Biston inscription or in Greek historian narrations in which again the narration of Daruis as one side of the event had a great impact on the ideas of the so-called impartial historians. Thus, based on the discursive analysis stated under the theoretical framework, we should analyze Biston inscription with regard to the speaker's intentions, social structure for the development of this text and its political function. The subject should include theorists, post-war thinkers, the Cummins' struggle against me (13, 13).

For example, when "Karen" is mentioned in the inscription, who narrates it and with what purpose, and what is the political function of the text and the words used in it? we also need to consider the social / ethnic / religious context that caused the text to be produced. To understand

the meaning of Geomata in the absence of the text, we should analyze the meaning behind his political action through the hermeneutic method and what his actions contain and what is his intentions about them.

As we have said before, in contrast to a small number of historians<sup>7</sup>, most of the overwhelming majority of the old and new scholars<sup>8</sup>, however, believed that Geomata became the king under the name of Bardia to renew the grandeur of the Mede (Dandamaif 1386: 171). According to the inscription of Bisotun and Herodotus' views, Bardia was from the land of the Mede and tried to re-establish the Median government, and he was relying on the the Medi-ans free folks (Diakonof, 1388: 397). According to the inscription of the Bisotun, the false Bardia appeared in the fortress of "pi - Shiawada" in the mount of "Arkadrish", this mountain and fortress has not been mentioned in the other sources but it might be in the land of the Mede. Geomata was also staying in the Mede at the end of his reign (the same, 392). It was previously assumed that PishiaOda is the same as Pasargad but after determining the etymology of the name of Cyrus' capital, today Pishiaoda is considered to be the "filing of writings". Althaim - ishtil have used many evidences to clarify the archives in the achaemenid era. The book Ezra reports that when searching for the command of Cyrus about the construction of the temple in Jerusalem, some Arami scrolls were found in his citadel in Hegmatane (Wishofer, 1389:4849). Although, the Pishiaowada's file is still open, it is impossible to determine the exact location of the base, however, according to the present evidences and the findings of this study that the inscription admits that geomata was killed in Media, it is more likely that its location is in Mede rather than in Persia. For that reason the Persian nobles did not notice bardia's absence, because, if he was in Persia, they would notice his absence sooner.

Herodotus wrote Geomata reigned for seven months, and his subjects were utilizing many advantages in his reign; as he was Median/kurd, all the inhabitants of Asia other than the Persians mourned at his death (stress is mine, Qadri) for as soon as he reached the throne, he exempted all the obedient nations of war and tax services for three years (Herodotus, 1387: 224). As Herodotus noted, all the inhabitants but the Iranians mourned the death of Geomata. In other words, only the Iranians were glad of the Geomatas' death. The meaning of this is that Geomata's actions were against the Persians and to undermine them and he had an anti – Persian/Iranian / approach

Gaumata had rightly understood the ideological and economic foundation of the Iranian Empire . The basis of the Empire and the civilization of Iran Land relied on the better religion and metaphysical legitimacy, looting and taxes from the obedient nations, and the militarism based on recruitment. Geomata cleverly aimed at the base of this empire . On one hand it drained the vital vein of the Persian Empire that depended upon the plundering of the other nations through relieving the taxes, on the other hand, with military exemption, the basis and foundation of the Persian military empire was destructed .

Zoroastrianism wasted away the legitimacy basis and the ideological foundation of the Iranians. By taking the possessions of the nobility which depended on the power of the nobility, it shocked the social / class structure of the Iranians since "the existence of the Achaemenid state relied to the army and taxation" (Ivanov, 91: 2006), which destroyed the identity of the Achaemenid Persian government by the loss of the army and taxation. He rightly considered the reemergence of the Mede in the decline of the Pars, and at the very beginning he did not insist on disclosing his Median being. He knew well that the weakening of Greater Iran itself

would achieve the reinforcement of the Medes. It was after the weakening of the army and the Persian aristocracy and the destruction of the temples that he transferred its capital to the Mede and then revealed its Median aspect.

The Tiorian wrote : " Geomat took Iranian (Persian) children and women to work on the King's estate" (, the same: 277). According to him " Geomata destroyed a lot in favor of the Medians that it caused a threat to the Iranian army ... exemption from military service for three years was to create discord in the Iranian army . The Persians disagreeing with Geomat, lacked the power to act ... the military's inability to resist was because at that time it was in Egypt" (Tiorin in Danmadaif, the same, 198-199) " he said. "Geomata called on all nations under the Achaemenid dynasty to separate from Iranians (Hermes, 1938, 33). Therefore, Ge-omata was rightly seeking to restore the grandeur of the Medes, and the essential condition to do this was the removal of the Persians. He had targeted Persians with his harsh attacks through obtaining the nobility's possessions, the destruction of temples, the forgiveness of taxes and the exemption of the military service; thus, he obliterated the foundation of the Iranian civilization and empire which relied on the elements of religious / metaphysical legitimacy, the militancy, the chaos and looting.

Geomata's actions had two aspects: on one hand, the emancipation of the dominated nations from under the oppression of Persians, on the other hand, the weakening of the Iranian empire.

Therefore, - as Herodotus says- all the nations of Asia except the Persians mourned in his death. Geomata forbade, the duty soldier, i.e. the base of the Persian liberal government and also the obedience to the owners of the estates, he destroyed the Achaemenid national monuments and he divided and forgave the lands of the Persian nobles.

"he abolished the military service and the government's ransom that Western Persia's Feudalism had been established on it. He removed the base and power of the Iranian government and the northern race; as the result, it was expected that the legacy of the indigenous people would reappear (the same, 62). Therefore, as most of the researchers such as Nurger (Nyberg, 1847,157-158), Spiegel (Spiegel, 1873,310), Herzfeld (Herzfeld, 1938,107), Oppert (Oppert, 1879,16), Herodorus (Herodotus, 1387: 225), Alföldi (Alföldi, 1388: 422 onwards) onwards) have indicated that Geomat's revolt has had a nationalistic aspect and it has been for the sake of reviving Median glory and the freedom from under the Persian dominance.

The revolts taking place against the Persians were national rebellions and the people recognised their own nationality, for instance, the Medes were aware of their own nationality, and in the inscription, there is no mention of the tribe - the Mede -, but it denoted the Mede nation. Although the nation is a modern concept and cannot be related to the ancient world, but the modern being of the nation's conception does not mean a lack of ethnic / national consciousness in the ancient world. Herodotus who is a historian of ancient times and he has certainly not been familiar with the today's modern concepts, he indicated the national selfconsciousness of the Medes in the events of the Harpagus's treason to Astiages: "Astiages asked Harpagus why he ascribed to himself Cyrus' work. Harpagus replied: " my letter caused Cyrus to uprising; therefore, all the glory of it is mine. Astiages told in the answer that in this case 'you are the most cruel and ruthless of people. You are the most stupid of all because if you had the power, you should have let the crown on your own head not the other, because the revolt was your own action , and you are



the most ruthless of all because of my sin (Astiag), you made all the Medes to serve the others; even if you disagreed with me, the honesty should have made you to make a Mede the king replacing me not an Iranian and now the Medes who have not been involved in harm to you have become slaves instead of superiors, the slaves of those who have already been your subjects" (Herodutes, 1387, 102). Thus, the national ethnic self - awareness and the conflict between the two Iranian people and the Kurdish nation has a long history. There has been a strong antipathy between the Persians and the Medes" (Widigirn, 1377, 202). The viewpoint of some investigators 9 which merely indicate the social aspect of Geomata's uprising and they consider his actions regarding the exemption of the taxes and military service and confiscating the aristocrat's property as ascribing to the whole empire is not quite correct since Geomata only appropriated the properties of persian aristocrats. We have no document of robbing aristocrat's properties of other nations like Babylon and ... his actions were directed at the people of Pars (Spiegel,89). Some veins of this historic event have also found its way into the myth of Kaveh and Zahhak as Kaveh is telling Zahhak of all seven states why only we should pay for your suffering and oppresion:

که شاهان منم کاوهی دادخواه خروشید و زد دست بر سر ز شاه ز شاه  
 آتش آید همییر سرم یکی بی زیان مرد آهنگرم بیاید بدین  
 داستان داورى تو شاهی و گر اژدها پیکری ... چرا رنج و سختی همه  
 بهر ماست که گر هفت کشور به شاهی تراست

He knew perfectly well that the Persian Empire was based on the power of the aristocracy, and with the weakening of the Persian aristocracy, it struck the pickaxe on the root of the Persian Empire. If the aim was merely social, why did not he divide the properties of the Persian aristocracy among the populace and Parsian freemen and why when he was ousted from power, the Persian folks did not mourn for him like the people of other nations. "The aim of Geomata was to destroy the concessions at the hands of the Persian nobility and to end their dominance in the economy and society, so it was killed by Iranian aristocrats". (Ivanov, 1358: 78 -79). Others have pointed to the religious aspect of Geomata's uprising like Hertel and Hints that considered the Geomata's revolt as the uprising of the old religion against Zoroaster religion, and others like Mesina and Dandamaif who have found Geomata as a Zoroastrian fanatic revolting against the old faith. This isn't the time to deal with the discussion of the Magi, and we'll come to it in detail later. It is only noted that the Magis were always Zoroastrianism and Zoroaster was the head of the Magis, and the Magis were not a Median tribe but Persian and they were original Zoroasterian priests against Mithra's rite. Geomata was not a Mage, not a Zoroasterian, but Zoroasterian fire temples were destroyed by him. As Hertel and Hertsfield have indicated, he was an anti- Zoroastrian, but unlike their ideas, he was not a Mage, because the Magis were Zoroastrian, too. However, unlike most of these scholars, Ge-omata's uprising both Zoroastrian and anti - Zoroastrian were not merely religious upheavals, although there

were religious aspects to it. If it was a religious uprising, why did the revolt not destroy the temples of other nations?. "If Geomata did this, his action led to the outbreak of rebellion in the other nations while there were no revolts against Geomata among other nations if the temples of defeated and subdued nations were destroyed, the Greek historians would certainly write something about it while the news of his murder affected all the dominated nations" (Dandamaif, 1386: 332). Therefore, he purely destroyed Iranian temples and Zoroastrian fire temples. The aim more than to be religious was the result of the Median national aspect and attack on the Persians' ideological beliefs. As a Median man who had lived in the same period of time with Cyrus rule, Geomata knew well that the Achaemenid Persian sword with the help of Zoroastrianism was conquered the Medes and the Mithraic religion and he found out well that to weaken the Persians, their national identity must be attacked which was based on the religion of Zoroaster.

There are other historians such as Markwart and Boyce who regarded the Geomata's uprising as the war of power and the game of politics inside the Persians empire itself. In response, it had to be said that if the war of power was merely internal power, it would make no difference for the other nations to riot in defense of him after killing Geomata by Darius or what difference it made for the Persians that they supported Darius against Geomata. If Bardia's aim was only to gain the power of the Persian Empire, he would certainly not exempt people from taxation and military service so as to undermine the base of his empire. Persianism of Darius against the Medes

Darius the king says "these people who follow me were my servants through Ahuramazda's will and they would pay me tribute to the will of the servants of my servants, whatsoever I told them to do, they would do it whether at night or in the day (DB. 1, 17 - 20). "Darius called other nations " slaves who must pay tribute" which they do not have freedom and the right to protest "what they were told from beside me ... they did it". "In the representations of the tribes in inscriptions, more emphasis is on political subjugation and domination for obtaining tribute than the cooperation of Darius:", "there were some tribes which Darius the king commanded them", you will notice that the Persian spear has reached too far away (Bryon, 1380: 272). "thus, Darius did not aim to unite Iran politically nor the aim to develop a shared domain for the domination of both Persians-Medians. When Pars is written in the lists, it is on the top .... The center of the kingdom Persia" (the same: 278). The rest of the tribes are merely mentioned as servants and tribute-payers. Essentially, Instead of the word Iran, more emphasis is put on the word "Pars" as they would have defined themselves against the Medes" (Wishofer, 1377:13).

Darius the king says:" the kingdom which the Mage had taken from Cambodia had long been our dynasty" (DB , 1 , 43 - 48 ). "Everyone who was loyal to me, I rewarded him and the one who betrayed me, I punished him severely. " The person who tried to do good to my family, I rewarded him, and the one who harmed it, I punished him " (DB , 4 , 61-67). According to Darius the Great, neither the common domination of the Medes and Pars nor the political unity of multi-national Iran land, but the right of absolute sovereignty was only restricted to the Persians, and the others like Geomata and Ferawartish when they did political participation, they were not only assumed as usurper and Demon but also the government was limited to the Achaemenid dynasty among the Persians.

The empire of the Iran land was based on the Persian tribe and the royal aristocracy, and it did not let the participation of other tribes and peoples. Herodotus writes , " The virtues of the

tribes as from the Persians viewpoint of were based on the spatial distance ... because they considered themselves as the best and as the center ... those farther away were worse ... " (Herodotus quoted from Beryan, the same: 278) . As against the Greeks, Persia ... which divided the world into continents, Achaemenids and Darius categorized the whole empire not according to the geographical, but ethnic basis . Pars was in the centre of the world ... with emphasis on the distinction of the Achaemenid from others and innovating the stories of the Astig dream, they began sanctify their government" ( the introduction on the book of the Geomata's revolt, Wishofer, 1389: 14-15).

Therefore , the Iranian Empire, neither a multicultural nor a multi-national country but from the period from Darius to Reza shah, has been based on Persian ethnitism, and other nations were named as slaves and servant tribes. Mentioning the name of the Mede was because of their proximity to the Persians rather than their shared ruling 10. Darius has written this inscription after the suppression of Geomata, Farahwartish and Chisertokhma's national uprisings; when he stresses on the Persian's spears and the right of Achaemenid dynasty, he addressed them as worthy of being the servants, not having equal alignment in power. In achaemenid period, there is no trace of Iran's political unity symbolized with the word of Iran (the same: 277 ).

Darius used the word *arya* in the limited sense of persian language , meaning the nobility and the gentleman addressed to the Persians and the royal family" (Beryan, the same: 287). The aristocracy as well as the upper class, is the same middle Persian tribe which, by looting the capital of other tribes, became the upper class and the inferior Mede caste turned into the inferior class. Therefore, the word Iran in its original meaning is utilized to refer to the upper class, i.e. the same Persian superior caste.

The Medes were introduced in Achaemenids inscriptions ( Apadana) as tax-payers (Jung , 2006, 90), while the Persians were the ruling nation and they were exempted from paying the taxes (Ivanov, 1979: 88). The repression from the side of Darius was due to his agreement with the Persian nobles (Cook, 1383: 144) and "The General Purpose of the Darius' inscriptions was reobtaining the kingdom power to the Achaemenid dynasty and the Persians tribe and to mark the honorable race and the properties of Persians" (Shahbazi, 1350: 22). To explain the importance of Persia to all, King Darius decreed to write four inscriptions at Persepolis two of them in Persian, King Darius: "I took some countries with the help of the Persians glory ... Seek this Persian glory, if Pars people are sought, Ahura will bestow them the happiness ... ( Bisotun quoting from Shahbazi, the same: 70 – 71). The Persian glory has taken some countries, that is, the other countries and tribes have come under the domination with the help of the Persian corp and through war, and they have become Persians/Iranian servants. King Darius says: " ... protect the Persian corp ..." in this sentence, Darius considers all his government based on the Persian army ( Jung, 2002: 105). He knows well that the Iranian foundation, the Achaemenid foundation, and the divine Ahormazd order is merely dependant on the Persian army and the violence and it does not have a cultural / identity foundation. The political order formed through the war and Persian army over which there was no ethnic groups relationship and it was protected from above through the rule of Persian empires. In his government structure, he used the Persians who secured the Persian / Tribal monarchy. The great offices of the state

and the court were all taken by Persian tribe" ( the same: 104 - 105). Darius layed the foundation of his government on the principle of Persian nobles and ethnicity (the same: 81) and it was restricted to Daruis own tribe in Persia. At the time of Daruis the first, Achamanid's ruling became a family affair, and the brothers, the bridegroom and the nephews of Darius had the power at their hands (Cook, 1383: 299).

The Persian -one ethnic Empire and Persian military power were the means of preserving their sovereignty over other tribes, and non-Persians became their tribute-payers. In gift-giving ceremony of all the nations in Apadana, the representatives of all ethnic groups offered their gifts; however, there is no news of Persians in these pictures since they were the lords of the great Iran and they would pay no ransom or gift .... Therefore, their image is not picturized on Apadana stairs ...the Medes presented gifts to the king of the kings with the horse gar-ments and the cups full of the precious stones and the Median clothing ... in Newrooz (Shahbazi, 1350: 80). The scribbles of Takht-e Jamshid shid and Takht-e Rostam, in whichthe representatives of thirty nations throned the king and raised him on their hands, in spite of Iranian historians<sup>11</sup>, is not a symbol of the contribution of the subordinate ethnic groups in imperial affairs, but it is a symbol of master / serfdom and the slave / slave relations. It meant that thirty ethnithities are slaves and servants of the Persian king. In spite of the other subjugated tribes, the real hatred of the Persia was against the Mede. The main emphasis of Achaemenid and Darius on Pars was more - as based on Wishofer- to define themselves against the Medes. "Although Waizdata had claimed Achaemenid right to become the king, he was not punished like Ferawartish and Chisertokhma (Jung, the same: 78). If Darius trans-ferred his royal court from the Madian Hegmatana to his homeland Persia, he had known from his many years of the struggle that the Aryan ruler of his country should be known as the national Persians king. Cyrus also knew the Persians' importance to survive ..." But Cyrus ... failed to fulfil his Persian wishes ," ( the same: 89). Cyrus has spent his life in the way of conquering countries, which those conquests were in the service of the troops and the Persians tribe, but Cyrus did not have the opportunity to internalize this authority. The action and the reality made and created by Cyrus was established and realized by Darius, that is, that is, he turned it into hegemony. I will examine below in discussing mythology the Cyrus' shrewd-ness in internalizing the domination of the Persia over the Mede depleting the Medes from coveying any meanings.

The last testament of Cambodia, which signals the Persians' hatred of the Medes, adjures the Persians that they must never let the supremacy and ruling be transferred to the Medes, if they gained kingdom with power, retake it with power; if through cunning, you have to use trickery, too ... ( Her , III , 65 ).

The aim of the Persian conquests was looting the properties of the other nations in favor of the Persian aristocracy. "The word Khashtopan or Satrap means the protector of the royal power. One of the basic tasks of Khashtropan is essentially the establishment of order and the expansion of Pars Power (Beryan, 1380:100). The Persian / Achaemenid Empire ruled through war and violence, and their policies under the name of Satrap-divisions, taxes and religion was the continuation of their wars and domination. The Persian religion, culture and rules was the internalization of the Persian war and violence.

Since the reign of Cyrus and Cambodia, the land allocation system has been executed in the conquered countries (the same:101). In the time of Darius being the king), they took some parts of the best land of the vanquished nations, and brought it under the possession of the hereditary property of the royal members and representatives of the Persian aristocracy; and the owners of these lands were exempt from paying tribute " (Ivanov. 1981: 85). In the eco-nomical aspect, Persian greatmen used slaves to work in Babylon and Egypt and among the Achamaniids, the slaves like herds were among the moveable properties and they were sold, inherited and given as gifts and there were craftsmen like (shoe smiths and architects) among the slaves (the same: 86). At the time of darius, the whole empire, with the exception of Pars, were subject to tax payment; the Persians were exempted from paying tribute, they did not carry out peonage or servitude as deduced from the Achamanid inscriptions and the other sources. The levies and the taxes of the defeated nations entered the treasury and entered the pocket of Persian aristocrats" (Danmadaif, 1386: 303-304). For this reason , with the death of Geomata, all Asia mourned except the Persians, as all the defeated nations were slaves to the Persians and the geomata's revolution were aimed at the salvation of Asia from under the slavery of Pars and the return of sovereignty to the Medes. Therefore, Persianism and the domination of Persian language and culture, plundering the territory and properties of other nations with the power of sword and militarism is not just the construction of Reza Shah and modern ideologies, but it has existed from the beginning of the development of Iranian civili-zation and government having its roots in the blood instinct of the Pars. All these led from "I have taken the Persian spears to far-fetched lands to "the gendarme of the region and "and the road to Qods passes from Karbala".

The Class Justice of Darius VS the Equality Justice of Geomata :

we identified the political wisdom of Iran with the components of the Persian single - ethnic government through the justification of divine charisma, class justice, religion / Zoroastrian culture, metaphysical legitimacy and ..., we went through these things in previous materials with regard to Persianism and we will try to test our hypothesis with regard to other components of class justice, religion culture and metaphysical legitimacy.

King Daruis "I returned the paddocks and the animals and the slaves with the properties the Mage had taken and belonged to Kara. "I settled "Kara", Iran, Mede and the other countries in their places as before. "I returned back what was confiscated ... ( DB , 1 , 67 - 71 ).

In this piece, Darius used the word "Kara" eight times. Oyer, Waisbach and Bartoloma have used "Kara " in the meaning of the army and the people. Yosti translated it into brave lords, Hertfield into the liberal people involved in the army and Konic and Yong into feudal lords.

Darius says after Cambodia's departure to egypt ... " Cambodia went to Egypt ... Kara became a rebel ... then all of the Karas rebelled and went away from Cambodia to him – Geomata" . Kara became Demons –arika – that is, they turned against Acahmanids, " all "the Karas" rebelled and joined Geomata ... Karas feared him, he killed many Karas, whatsoever Geomata has taken from Kara , I gave it back".

In this text, "Kara" is used in different and conflicting meanings of which Darius deliberately tries to divert its meaning through playing with words. Indeed, apart from finding the relations of text terms with each other, we need to explore the relationship of the text with the political / social context to understand the true meaning of the text. Aliyev is well aware of this paradox and the different meanings of the work.

In fact, if we consider all the words "Kara" as identical and having a notion, the text is meaningless and illogical. The same KarAS that would rise up against the Achaemenid and would join Geomata and they also would join Darius. If Geomata had taken Karas' possession and property, why they all joined him and rebelled against Darius and why all Karas that Darius had taken back their properties, they rebelled against Darius instead of expressing gratitude toward him after killing Geomata. Therefore, Darius deliberately employed the word "Kara" in two meanings, and by playing with the word Kara tried to show his actions in another way and far from truth to future generations" (Aliyev, 1388: 444 – 445).

In the following, Aliyev explained the different meanings of Kara according to the political context of Darius 's administration and its political function. Studying the meaning of Kara brings us to this conclusion that each time it implies to a certain social group. In cases where Darius says that Kara joined Geomata and became a rebel, or they rebelled after killing Geomata against Darius, it indicated all classes and people and in cases where he says I returned Kara's possession, he means the army and the nobility. Since what is certain is that Darius suppressed the rebellions with the army and the ten thousand men of the king guards, he suppressed his rebellion, but Geomata had no support but the masses of the populace due to his act to exempt people from soldiering, who mourned on his death as according to Herodotes. Most of the common people had no household goods or slaves so as for Geomata to usurp them; therefore, Geomata has usurped the property of the Persian tribal aristocracy in a way that when Geomata was killed, Darius returned people's properties to them and he encountered the rebellion of a large number of people throughout the empire. (the same: 446).

Therefore, according to Herodotes, who writes : "Geomata the mage pursued the policy of improving the situation of the public is not contradictory with the inscription to Bisotun where he writes: "Goemata deprived the people of some financial rights and so on" as the Spiegel says. The Bistoon inscription has been written under the decree of someone who killed Gemata with his own hands; as a matter of fact, he has exaggerated about the existence of animosity between the public and the people, and he has intentionally included the class of society that had suffered from his reforms as the people. Thus, text is only analyzed in relation to text writers, social context, and political function of the text.

Gaumates made all the people of the empire to side with him, but Darius, as soon as he threw Gemata down, he faced tough resistance in all the states of the country (Diakonov, 1388: 394-395). Therefore , the supporter of Darius' Kara are the army and the nobility, and the supporter of Geomata's Kara are all the people and the freemen. By taking the property of the nobles in Pars, and forgiving the taxes that went into the pockets of the aristocracy, Geomata, from one way, helped to weaken the aristocracy and the army, and from the other way, he divided the properties of the aristocracy and exempted all the people from taxation. Therefore, "Geomata was a social revolutionist and pioneer of Mazdak" (Wishofer, 1389: 89). Many other scholars

saw Geomata as the enemy of the feudal and the feudal system, and due to his struggle for the interests of the public, they consider him as the predecessor of Maz-dak and peasant movements (Hertsfield, Konik, Winkler and ... Quoted by Aliyev, 1399: 89). In the opinion of many historians, he confiscated the nobles' land and slaves and he abolished the taxes levied by the peasantry to the aristocrats, and he abolished the military service (Dandamayov, 1386: 291). Geomata was the enemy of the aristocrats, the nobles, and the government of the Achamenids; he took the land and the slaves from the aristocrats, and he abolished the taxes of the villagers to the feudals (Hinz, 20; Herzfel, 1933, 35).

Danmadaif accepts Geomatas' opposition to the aristocrats, but he considers it not in the direction of public interest but the concentration of the government power (Danmadaif, 1386: 289 onwards). In the continuation, Dandamaif brings some material that he rejects his own views: "when Darius canceled the reforms of Bardia and restored the privileges of the tribal aristocracy, the whole empire rose to revolt, and the whole nations under the occupation of Achaemenid rule faced rebellions, and many of the rebellions were due to the abolition of the reforms and against the concessions bestowed to tribal aristocrats" (Dandamaif, the same: 290).

If his actions were in the direction of despotism and the centralisation of the government, why – as based on Herodotus - all Asia wept for his death, and why did all the nations revolt as soon as he was killed? How dominated nations have sacrificed their freedom and self-determination for the sake of the centralisation of the government under the sovereignty of a certain ethnic group, why all nations under the occupation of the Persians revolted from as soon as Geomata was killed, What difference did it make for the nations that it should be dominated by the government or by the aristocracy? Geomata must have taken measures for the sake of the welfare and freedom of the nations that he was easily accepted by them and, as soon as he was killed, they defended him, certainly the dictatorship and centralization of the state is not in the interest of any dominated nation so as they revolt for the sake of it.

Also, which centralization of the state will be fulfilled with the forgiveness of taxes and the exemption of the soldiery? the foundation of the Achaemenid empire was based upon taxation and the army was dependent upon conscription. If Geomata's goal was the centralization of the government, how would he be able to achieve it without the power of the army and the taxes? How could he collide with the nobility without power? Meanwhile Dandamaif considers Cambodia's goal as a fight against the aristocracy for the centralization of the state. If Geomata and Cambodia had the same equal goal, what reason would there have been for Geomata to revolt against Cambodia (Wishofer, 1389: 89). If they both had the same goals, why no one mourned on Cambodis' death?

In the days when the empire was on the brink of split, the suspension of the soldiery and the taxes, for the person pursuing the aims of Cambodia, was no doubt an appropriate solution. More than everyone the King depended on military service and taxes, without the military power, any attempt to create a centralized government was due to fail (Wishofer, the same: 90). Therefore, there would be no other purposes for forgiving taxes and military service at the time of the collapse of the Empire but its complete collapse. "He gave the nobilities' properties to the common people, which was supported by the broad number of the common people; moreover, the uniqueness of this man's program, with his non-realistic belief, can only

compared with Mazdak in those days (Wishofer, the same: 91; Aliov, 1388: 464). 12The exemption of the taxes by Geomata in Cambodia's time means it has existed in Cambodia's time (Wishofer, the same, 80). From the tax code, it might be inferred that the tax burden of Cambodia was skyrocket and it was hard for a lot of people to pay it ... for the conquests of Cyrus and Cambodia, the farmers had been deprived of panting in the farms –the youth were in the army; thus, there was no work force- the pressure on the people and the youth urged them to enter the army (the same: 83 -84). Therefore , Dandaif's argument regarding the continuation of the path of Cambodia by Geomata, in order to centralize the power of the Empire, is contrary to the objectivedirrection of the events and Dandaif's reasoning is not only a paradox, but there is no historical document available to it.

After being able to settle down dozens of rebel nations, Darius regained the clan privileges, and these concessions remained until the last moments of the Achaemenid Empire (Hintz, 1386: 298). As Plato had said, Darius divided the kingdom into seven parts among his accomplices in the killing of Samirdis (the same: 298). Up to the end of the Achaemenid, all supreme offices of the army and country remained in the hands of the tribal aristocracy whether in Iran or outside Iran (the same: 299). Until the end of the Achaemenid dynasty, tribal relations powerfully remained, and from the moment of the establishment of the Achaemenid dynasty to the last hours of this dynasty, its army was always busy doing the war campaigns. (the same: 300). The sovereignty and authority of the tribal aristocracy in the administrative apparatus of the conquered countries urged the looting of property and the weakening of the productive forces of those states (the same: 299-300). In the plundering of the property of the conquered nations, the dominant tribe of Persia turned into the superior class and the coquered castes to the inferior class and it is because of this reason that Pirberyan rightly uses the top - class tribe for the Persians. It is natural that when they destroyed the economy and the production of the occupied Nations, some people from other Nations have entered the system of the Persian Empire for personal gains and they have strongly defended the empire such as the Median aristocrats.

Therefore, the same conditions that led to the fall of theMedes empire were among those who led to the assassination of Geomata (Wishofer, the same: 88), that is, the revival of equality and anti - class justice, which represented the social life of the Medes opposed to class justice and the oligarchy tyranny. "The struggles of that period are at the times when communal life style wanted to be transformed into feudal and capitalism and wealth accumulation; two cases are: one in the pre-history, that is, the clash between Zahakians (Astiag – Qaderi) and Faridonian (Cyrus- Qadri) and the other one is historical: it is the struggle between Geomata and Daruis the first and Faridon in which they removed the communal system of the Zahak's era. Nevertheless,Geomata intended to reestablish the previous system of communism which had been changed into a system of capitalism, feudalism, and personal or family possession by Achamainds" (Razi , 1382: 36). the history of iran continued through the system of Plato 's justice system with cyrus/Faridon against Zahak/Astiag, Daruis agains Geomata and Ferawartish and Anoshiwan against Mazdak; hence, the history of the Kurds continued through the system of communal justice from Zahakto Geomata and later Mazdak and Khoramdinan.



We need to consider the method of the discourse analysis discussed in the introduction of the book and the theoretical foundations presented to understand the concepts of the text. There exists the relation between the text and the words used such as Ahormazd and the lie in which Darius considers himself as the representative of the Ahormazd and the political opponents as a liar. The speaker of the text is the one who regards himself as the representative of the truth, and the one who is defined as the liar does not have a contribution in writing the text to defend himself. The relation of the context of the text should be taken into account with regard to the ethnic / religious context and its political function. e. g. the context of the Persian/Zoroastrian/ethnic/religious struggle and the political function of the text that followed the violent suppression of Median revolt; further, we should consider giving legitimacy to the domination and suppression in the name of the Ahormazd facts and the justification of the suppression of political opponents in the name of lies and evil. In fact, concepts of lies and Ahriman have been addressed to political opponents defending equality justice against despotism and hierarchical justice, and Ahormazd and truth are the ideology of despotism and the class order of the society. We have to explore the mental meaning of Mede and Geomata by interpreting her actions due to the lack of written text. According to the theoretical foundations that we discussed, the text and the truth expressed lack the meaning and meaning is outside the text in political power and the ethnic interests of Pars which the empire is its military instruments and the religion and heavenly truths are the hegemonic tools of Pars / Darius.

Darius the king says: "By the grace Ahormazd I am the king. Ahormazd gave me the kingdom – these are the countries that has come to me thanks to Ahormazd ... He gave me these countries ...". Darius repeats the name of Ahormazd on the inscription over 69 times, and he finds all his triumphs and conquests as blessings from Ahormazd. He sees his actions as Ahormazdian (godly) and the enemies and insurgents as evil and followers of lies. Darius equals himself to the truth and the revolt to the liar (Garsowit, 1385: 110). The text is an indication of the metaphysical legitimacy and the divine right of Darius and disregard for popular acceptance. But we have no document of whether Geomata or Ferawartish have taken refuge in or sought support from metaphysical legitimacy or a particular god or regard their actions as derived from a certain god. While we do not have a specific document in the proof of its reverse; however, given the measures of Geomata against Darius, the popular/earthly being of

Geomata versus Darius' reliance on farah Izadi. Through forgiving the taxation and service exemptions, which was in the direction of the fight against the aristocracy and the government, and in the way of the interests of the people, Geomata has done more than any other claim in the path of the legitimacy of the people and disregarding the metaphysical legitimacy. His acceptance from beside all freemen of the nation shows his legitimacy among his people. Like Darius, if Geomata was not reluctant to the wishes of the people and did not consider himself responsible for them, he would refer his action to a heavenly God, he acted solely on personal interests oblivious to the general demand. Darius gives legitimacy to himself in a few ways, from one hand belonging to the Achaemenid, the Persian tribe and the Aryan, and from the other way to the divine right of the kings (Wishofer, 1377:79). If we look at the Biston inscription carefully (view images), it is clearly demonstrated as the basis of Iranian political reason and its anti Kurds quest for identity. Ahormazd presents the Ring of sovereignty to Darius, who holds his right hand toward Ahormazd and he has the arch in his left hand which is the symbol of the kingdom. Therefore, the reciprocal relationship between ahormazd (the Lord of the World) and his successor Darius has been completed, and "the defiance of the King's order

means the defiance of the universal order and the moral order" (Garsewit, 1385:110). Behind Darius there are a few of the noble men, and the Median Ge-omata is depicted beneath Darius's feet. Our research hypothesis – political ration of Iran with the components of metaphysical legitimacy (Ferah Izadi or divine glory), aristocracy (Platonic justice ), religious culture and ... have been developed vs . Kurds' quest for identity is quite evident in this inscription in which Daruis receives his legitimacy from Ahormazd. His supporters are Persian aristocrats, and the one who lies beneath his feet Kurd Geomata. He shows off the basis of his power and legitimacy to Geomata, Ferawartish and Chisertokhma.

The justification of legitimacy was necessary for both Darius and Cyrus, for both were the Usurpers and had come to the throne through the military victory; Cyrus overthrew his Median lord and created and so did Darius ousted Geomata (Garsivit, the same: 122). For this reason, both of them took refuge in the metaphysical / divine legitimacy in the absence of popular acceptance. Darius used the principles and beliefs of Zoroastrianism to legitimize his rule (the same,131). Through the alliance of religion and the state, and reliance on the ethnicity of Pars and the aristocracy, Daruis addressed the opposition and the common people as the evil and liar. Indeed, the state was the military instrument of the Persians tribe/class and the religion as its hegemonic tool. Instead of relying on metaphysical legitimacy and in order to preserve its power, Geomata carried out some practical reforms such as the exemption of the taxes and military service, and the division of property among the public; thus, he acquired the legitimacy among the people, and when the kingdom has the legitimacy of the people, it does not require the military army and the creation of the gods and the support of the nobility to gain legitimacy. Thus, he exempted people from military service since he did not need a strong government. He exempted people from paying the taxes because he did not need the support of the nobles due to having legitimacy of the people and based on having earthly le-gitimacy, he did not need the Gods to obtain legitimacy. If Darius and Cyrus took the sol-diers of other nations through force to fight for them, all the nations supported Geomata and his actions without compulsion even after his killing. In the same way, the old and the young -as Herodutes said - supported Astiag against Cyrus. But, the only supporters of Darius were the government army and the Persian aristocracy. Daruis –as Bois said - considered the politi-cal order in the continuation of the cosmic order of Ahura Mazda and he regarded himself earthly symmetry of Ahourmazd, and his seven aristocratic companions as the symbol of the Seven Amshaspandan. As Ahormazd is the absolute tyrant and not responsive to anybody in the divine order, Daruis is also the absolute ruler and not responsive to anybody in the earthly /political order. But as we have said, we have no evidence of Geomata's reference to God for legitimacy. Certainly, if it was also the case, Darius was glad to declare his god victory over the god of the enemy and to mention it proudly in the inscription. However, the ritual of Mithra was antimetaphysical and it considered the contract between two parties as the foun-dation of legitimacy, not the hierarchical order and the preliminary sacredness.

" I rebuilt the Aidana - temples - that were destroyed by the Mage, " says Darius Shah. The researchers were in a state of confusion in the translation of Darius' words. They avoided the translation of the Aidana to the temple as Herodutes, the main source of ancient Iranian history, denied the existence of temples in Iran. They did not know that Herodutes intention in denying the existence of temples in Iran was that the Iran temples were not the form of Greek temples. "Today it is not acceptable to say that the Persians / Achaemenids did not have the temple and the firetemples" ( Schwartz, the same: 829) and" there is no doubt in the existence of the

temples of the Achaemenid" (Dandaif, 1386: 322). Archaeology confirms the existence of sacrificial altar and altar in the Achaemenid Empire (Cook, 13 : 267). The monuments of Achamanid religion shows the profound effect of Zeroaster (Hintz, 1386: 83). "Today we know at least twenty places in the Pars which there has existed firetemples at the time of Da-rius and there the Zoroastrian prayer were performed. "Due to the lack of the names inspired by Zoroastrianism in the tablets of Persepolis, Gerishwich has also casted doubts on the accuracy of Binonist' theory (Cook, 1386: 83). therefore , "the temples which Geomata have de-stroyed are the Persians places" (Wishofer, 1389: 98). J.Oyer who knows Geomata as the enemy of Zoroastrianism regards the temples as the same Zoroasterian temples which he ruined. Hertel and Hertsfield also considered Geomata as the enemy of Persian Zoroastrian temples (Diakonov, 1388: 485). Therefore, there is no doubt today that Darius' meaning about Apadana are the Zoroastrian fire temples which Geomata destroyed due to being Mithraism.

Messina, Wishofer and Dandaif are right in considering Zoroastrian being of Mages, but they are wrong in considering Geomata as the Mage and a prejudiced Zoroastrian priests. Even though Hertel and Hertsfield have paved the right way in knowing Geomata as the antiZoroastrian, but they have moved out of the truth path in regarding Gomata as a Mage. Because every discussion of Darius and Geomatas religious struggle is subject to the enlightenment of the Magi, first I need to clarify the question of the Mage before going on any other discussion. Herodutes' theory in knowing the Median being of the Mages, like the rejecting the existence of temples in Iran, has led to a lot of confusion among the researchers. The presentation of any views on the religious struggle of the early years of the Achaemenid empire hinges on revealing the discussion on Mages, their nationality and religion which we will try to explain in the following. Our theory is that the Mages are not Median, but the Persians priests, or at least the free priests who, like the Islamic preists, professed and preached Zoroastrian religion and they were from different nationalities. Thus, Geomata was not a Mage, but an anti -Mage and an anti -Zoroastrianism.

#### Mages, their religion and ethnicity

Like many other issues of Iran history, the issue of the Mages has also been distorted. The distortion which is rooted in the deviation of historical truths caused by the ruling system of the Achaemenid empire is also sealed as the science of history by the father of the historians. According to modern information and conflict of theories with each other, any statement in this field will not be more than at the level of an adventure. Based on the fact that most of the theories in this field are not far beyond the unproved hypotheses, we will also venture to present a new hypothesis regarding the Mages, and we will introduce a new point of view about the Mages.

As we have mentioned before, any theory about the religious struggle of zoroastrianism and Geomataa is subject to the enlightenment of the issue of the Mages. Without doing research about the Mages, giving any comment in this field is baseless, although the discussion in this field has numerous aspects, that is, a variety of theories have been presented about the Mages

and their relation to Zoroastrian religion. Some scholars, such as Darmester, Sheder and Messina considered the Mages as the true masters of Zoroaster and Zoroaster as the Mage (Aliof, 1388:457). Messina is one of those scholars who are specialized in the field of the Mages and their relation to Zoroastrianism. He pointed out that there were two levels of clergymen in Zoroastrianism; a level for the common people whom he called Soziallehre and another group who had the religious codes in their disposal and they instructed the nobles and princes religiously and they were among the first followers of Zoroastrianism (Messina, 1929, 313-320). He denied that the Mages were a class of priests from the Mede and he considered them as the followers of Zoroaster (Messina, 1930, 14). Others like Hertel, Hertsfield, Estrova, Widingern, Hints and Razi regarded the Mages as the enemy of Zoroaster religion and its distorters. Among the old historians, Herodotus considered the Mages as a Median tribe and Strabo knew them as Persian. Among the new researchers, Hertel, Hertsfield, Widingern and ... regard the Mages as a Median tribe but Messina considered the Mages as a Persian tribe and Dandamaif and Boyce have already doubted the Median being of the Mages. Although in ancient times it was known that not all the Mages are Median (Dandamaif, 1386: 209). However, Herodotus' theory in this field has prevailed on history, which has introduced the Mages as a Median tribe.

The historians supporting the Median being of the Mages and anti-Zoroastrian have relied on some reasons that we shall continue to examine each of their arguments and critique their weaknesses in the following in order to prove that the Mages not only were not Median but they were Iranian / Persian, and not only they were not Zoroastrianism but they were the original and orthodox followers of the Zoroastrian religion.

It is necessary to take a look at the point of view of Albert de Jung who simply challenges the Median being presumption of the Mages prior to presenting our arguments regarding the rejection of the Median being of the Mages.

"The notion of the Median existence of the Mages relies on two minor witnesses, the first thing to observe is that they have inserted a word perhaps to be read as Median before the Geomata's name in the Babylonian version of Darius' inscription in Bisotun that no one has ever noticed because Darius has never neglected to mention the fact that Geomata is from the Mede. There are six Median tribes which Herodotus named them that cannot be understood as Medes like "Magoi" which can be interpreted in several ways without any justification resulting in Median being of the Mages and turning into the class of priests. Thus, they have deceived us in such a way that most of the misunderstanding regarding the different aspects of Zoroastrian religion are allocated to the harmful impact of these so called Median Mages. Many scholars, even a few of the greatest researchers in this way, constructed a proper image of the original Zoroastrian theology especially to Zoroaster himself in the past which have been distorted by the subsequent generations particularly by Median Mages (Yong, 1390: 138-139). In short Jung really lights many untold facts in this statement as if the word used in Herodotus' text and the inscription in Bisotun has been translated through negligence to the Mage, and it is possible that it conveyed the meaning of the Mede, not the Mage. In the following, we will present the criticisms regarding the Median being of the Mages.

One of the most important sources and bases of researchers which have known Mages as ethnic Median tribe is relying on the theory of Herodotus who has considered the Medes as one of the

six Median tribes and also in which he has introduced Gaumata as a Median Mage which we will investigate to understand how much authenticity the words of Herodotus has.

Based on Diakonof's view, among the six tribes named by Herodotus, i.e. Bosian, Partakinian, Estrokhianian, Bodyan and Mages, only the Partakinian tribe in the Isfahan district has an Iranian origin and Arizantian has a clear derivation of the Iranian origin; since the Ari-zantian has been identified as an Aryan tribe, other Median tribes could not have had the Aryan origin, so they were not Iranian. The main mass of the Medes were composed of the Gothians, Ilamites and Kasian tribes who have acquired the language of Indo-European new-comers. The Mages and Arinzintian lived in the east of Mede near Rega in the present Teh-ran, Bosian were in Hamadn and Bozian were the easternmost tribe of the Mede. Herodotus in the 4th century B.C. when the Persians - Achaemenids had mastered the Mede, wrote the book, that is, he wrote the names of the Median tribes in the Iranian becoming period and the time of the influence of the Persians in the Mede meaning that later, through occupying the territory of the Mede, tribes of the Persian aristocracy penetrated in the Mede land. As some tribes of the Arabs moved there after its conquest by the Arabs. Therefore, the mentioning of Iranian tribes in the MedeLeague in Herodotus book was not a compelling reason for their presence in the Mede Union in the 7th century. In naming the Persian tribes for the formation of the Persian Achaemenid empire, Herodotus has mentioned some tribes which did not formerly existed or they were natives or Sakaian, and then they have merged with a political alliance or declaration of subordination have gone under the rule of the Persians (Zarinkoob, 1368, 85). For instance, he considered Sagartian as one of the Persian tribes (Khodadadian: 1378:4). They were the same Sagartians who took the lead of the Mede ethnicity under the leadership of Chisertokhma against Darius after Ferawartish (Bryan, 1381: 183). Hertsfield and Hints correctly regarded Sagartians as the Medes and as the ancestors of the today's Kurds (Hertsfield in Nikitin, 1377: 49; Hints, 1386, 55). Probably after the defeat of Chisertokhma from Darius, the Sagartians and their military elites may have pledged allegiance to the Persians or even some of them have been forced to flee to the Persian regions, so Herodotus have brought them in the same line of the Persians. therefore, as the Sagartians regarded as the Persian tribes by Herodotus were not originally Persians, but Medians, the Mages considered as the median tribes by Herodotus were not Median but Persian.

Herodotus has also introduced Geomata as a Median Mage. Two different interpretations can be taken from Herodotus' theory. We can ask whether the Median being of the Geomata revolt, and then Darius ideological propaganda in introducing Geomata as the Mage caused the formation of the Median being theory of the Mages, or the default theory of the Mages being Median, and then the introduction of Geomata as a Mage by Darius that made the Median being of the Gaumata revolt to be formed.

Danmadaif says: "In introduced Geomata as the Mage, Darius has never meant his race, but then the Greek writers have gradually had such a wrong assumption that the mages were only

from the Medes. For this reason, the Gaumata rebellion introduced as the Mage by Darius and the Mages considered as the Medians by the Greek historians made the revolt inferred as the Median (Dandamaif, the same, 209). In response, it must be said that the result of this argument is reverse. It was evident for the old historians living not too far much a time from Gaumata that the insurrection had been a Madian revolt against the Persians; but as some scholars have pointed out that Herodotus had taken its information on the Gaumata uprising from the descendants of the seven killer aristocrats (Cook, Gerishwich, 1387: 240) and since Darius sent copies of the Bisotun inscription to the all lands including Greece, the Median being of the revolt was evident for Herodotus and other Greek historians from one hand, and on the other hand the information acquired as the result of Darius' ideological propaganda had introduced the revolt as from the Mage, and the default of the Median being of the Mage developed in the minds of ancient writers. Therefore, not as Dandaif says, the Median being of the introduction of the revolt by the Greek historians was not because of knowing the Mages as the Median, but in reverse, the introduction of the Mages as Median was because of Median knowing of Gaumata revolt. "Putting the emphasis that Greeks have considered Gaumata as from the Mede just due to his being a Mage is completely baseless" (Aliov, the same, 431). People in ancient time knew that all the Mages are not Median (Dandamaif, the same, 209); thus, knowing Gaumata as Median from beside the Greeks represents a historical fact (Aliov, 1388, 431). Therefore, Dandaif's syllogisms do not result in what he concludes from and the opposite results can be deduced from them. As indicated by Dandaif, many ancient and modern historians have no doubt on the Median being of the Gaumata uprising. As Dandaif noted earlier, people knew in ancient times that the Mages are not Median (Dandamaif: the same). Therefore, not only the Median knowing of the Mages did not set up the Median theory of an insurrection, but the apparent Median being clarity of the revolt has led to the introduction of the Gaumata as the Mage, not because Gaumata was a Mage, but as the result of the Darius' propaganda. Ancient writers like Plato and Herodotus had no doubt in knowing the revolt as Median; however, since they got informed of the event from beside Darius' propaganda, as he introduced Gaumata as Mage to humiliate him, they regarded Gaumata as Mage and the view of Median being of the Mage was formed.

Many scholars know the parallelism of Herodotus' statements with the inscriptions of Bisotun as a reason for the validity of Herodotus' history, but this is not only causing the credit for Herodotus' history but the discredit for it. Herodotus and Darius' overall convergence is not trustable; the Bisotun text has been published in all the states. Did Herodotus refer to it? (Beryan, 1380, 153). "Through the aid of the major languages of the Empire, Darius had begun an extensive campaign and translated the inscription in other languages, including Greek and distributed it among the Greek people (Dandamaif, 1383: 183). Herodotus has also used the translations of the inscriptions in Greece, even Ralín says: "There are some points in Herodotus' book involving the word for word translation of the inscription regarding a mother and a father ... and influenced by the story of inscription, he has mentioned Samirdis as a Mage" (the same: 186).

Herodotus has derived its information from Zopyros or Otanes, or the seven Persian killer aristocrats, since "his story matches with the claims of seven people. Herodotus was familiar with the son of Megabios, Zopyros, who had fled to Athens, and with Otanes, who operated on the Greek fringe" (Cook, Gerishwich, 1387:240). "Darius' effort to acknowledge Gaumata's revolt was successful, all but Achilles called Bardia a Mage ... So it is impossible to agree with

Hertel's view about the Herodotus reliance on Bisotun inscription " (Dandamaif, the same: 181). Therefore, the equality of Herodotus sayings with the inscription in Bisotun is not the proof of the true statements of Herodotus but it raises doubts about him. As discussed in the story of Cyrus – Herodotus narrated the mythical legend of Kiyani rather than history, he has also told the Cyrus' constructed story of Gaumates revolt rather than history, and in the absence of other historical sources, it has puzzled researchers for centuries. The matter is not on the details of Herodotus history but on the existence or non-existence of his being; hence, the question is if Herodotus did not exist, would all this deviation ever take shape in history? Through writing history, Herodotus made history baseless and political as myth.

One of the deviation regarding the historical knowledge about the Mages and the incorrect Med-being calling of the Mages and Mage-calling of Gaumates is rooted in the same distortion of the King Darius and its retelling by Herodotus. That is, it is the habit of kings and power owners to always introduce their opponents in humiliating titles; even today they are introducing Kurd political activists with titles such as thugs, smugglers, and ... . To prevent the next riots of the Medes and to humiliate the fans of Gaumates who obeyed him for seven months, Darius declared Gaumates as a Mage who lacked the kings' competence. By overturning the history, Darius named himself the true king of the royal family and Gaumates as a usurper Mage. As Cyrus regarded his riot as a god-given king, and he interpreted the king being of Gaumates as dragon and monster, in fear of hurting the Medes' feelings and their subsequent uprisings, he called the killing of the Medes as the killing of the Mages. Therefore, in contrast to Herodotus and many contemporary scholars, Mages-killing has not been carried out and in contrast to Marquardt, the entire killing was the result of the distortion of the word "Bagyadish" meaning Mage-killing. Marquardt says this Mage-killing festival is probably the same Bagayadis-Mehragan celebration- in which the word Mage has been heard instead of God, that is, Bag (Marquardt quoting Widingern, 1377: 201). This fact that the meaning of Mage-killing was taken mistakenly from the name of a festival and all subsequent generations have accepted this mistake is indeed bold and impossible" (Widingern, the same: 292). To discourage the legitimacy of the Median Gaumates and to gain legitimacy for his usurp, and to scorn the revolt of the Medes, Darius describes Gaumates as a Mage in order to pre-tend that the Mages had no monarch jurisdiction and qualification. In order not to hurt the feelings of the Mages, Darius represented their massacre as the killing of few worthless Mages. Thus, as Widingern have noted, knowing all of these murders and slaughters, which the memory of subsequent generations have preserved, as limited to being due to the falsification of a word is quite presumptuous; the murder has been committed but not the murder of the Mages but the Medes. To distort the fact and not to arouse the Medes' sensitivity, they introduced such a massacre as the killing of the Mages as today they are introducing the killing of the Kurd political activists as the killing of the thugs and smugglers. Thus, the massacre of the Mages was not carried out, as Marquardt and Dandamaif have noted, given the increasing importance and influence of the Mages in the administration of Darius and Achaemenid dynasty, the Darius' hostility to the Mages and their murder was not likely to have occurred. But Darius wanted, apart from the humiliation of the Medes, to warn the Mages that their power were growing not to encroach upon the power of government. "Darius called himself as the establisher of the Godly (Izadi) system; therefore, the struggle between Darius and the Mages was not a struggle between two religions: Darius did not bring a new religion, he did not disturb the Mages society,

the struggle of Darius with the Mages was an effort to make himself known as the supreme religious authority” (Colnes in Jung, 1390: 136). The Magi had grown a great deal and that Cambodia diffuse the court to a Mage in his absence showed their great influence in the political apparatus of the Achaemenid empire. Darius regularly called Gaumates in the name of his class, the Mages to convey this powerful message that the Mages class do not have the right to seize the royal place as Darius tried to restore the divine (Izadi) order to the king in which the society was classified into three classes of the clergy, the warriors, and the peasantry (Jung, the same 138). Darius introduced himself directly as the representative of the Ahormazd without a mediator which we will state its reasons below in the section on mythology.

Because Median revolt had not yet been made public like Ferawaartish uprising in the time of Gaumata revolt, the news about the killing of the Medes was distorted and introduced as the killing of the Mages. Darius, who suppressed the failed revolt of the people –Gaumates –, would remove the memory of the revolt and their social program that it seems that the Magekilling indicated by Herodotus has been at the service of the distortion and suspension of the historical origin of the uprising teachings to mark the uselessness of the revolt to the conquered side (Sadeghi’s introduction on the book on gaumates, Wissofer, 13). Darius insists a lot to regard Gaumates as from the Mages’ class and to consider him incompetent to rule. This is the same art in which Darius not only suppressed and murdered the Medes, he also tries to make the Medes miss their memory and he tries to occupy the Medes’ mentality. Among his activities in this regard are distorting the time of Mehr and moving it from Mehr to Fall in order to change the Medes’ memory from victory to defeat. Darius confiscated Median parties such as Mehregan and he succeeded in changing the meaning, time and "the other" of it so that Kurds even after thousands of years celebrate the Newroz with the meaning constructs that Darius molded on them, such as anti – Azhidahak/Astiag and Kaveh-iking which I have mentioned before (Mitra, Spring or Fall). On the other hand, Marquardt properly considered the slaughtering of the Medes ( that Marquardt regarded as the killing of the Mages) as impregnated with Mehregan, that is, the spring Mehregan were transferred to the autumn, because the Gaumates defeat was in spring and the killing of the Medes in this celebration. The spring celebration of the Median victory over Persia and Assyria and so on becomes their own defeat and killing celebration.

Therefore, due to Darius’ mis-campaign in scorning and distorting Gaumates, he mistakenly introduces Gaumates as Mage and since the Median being of the uprising was obvious and evident for him and all the ancient writers, unwittingly, the median being of the Mages was formed in his mind, and a great historical mistake – that is, the Median being of the Mages was endorsed in history.

As we said, the killing done by Darius could not have been the killing of the Magi. Because the Mages at Darius’ apparatus did not lose their positions, but day by day their status got increased more and more. Because of the unification of Achaemenid government and Zoroastrianism from the time of Cyrus on, the Mages had been the official religious preachers of the Achaemenid dynasty from the very beginning and they maintained their position to the end. Cyrus consigned the victims of the gods into the hands of the Mages (Ginzon, Bitá: 147) and



even - according to Nicholas the Damascus: the teaching and the training of Cyrus was carried out as according to the philosophy of the Mages ( Rezai, 1384: 326). The Mages were powerful on the same day that Cyrus was sitting on throne. The evidences of their influence are the existence of the firetemples, the tombs of shrines, promoting the virtues and preventing the vices ...” (Boyce, 1375: 100). Giinfon says in issues related to the gods, Iranians knew the rules of following the clergy more important than everything else (Gizinfon, the same: 315) and he knew the establishment of the Mages as the work of Cyrus the great ( the same, 316) After overcoming Astiag, Cyrus founded the Zoroastrian priesthood (Boyce, 1375: 316). The Mages among the Persians are the celebrants of the cult of worship ( Herodotes quoting from Brian, 1380: 147).

Some of the Mages were of the retinue of the kings from the time of Cyrus and Cambodia. As Politini says it was the Mages to recommend that the tomb of Cyrus be to the east (Book 6, Chapter 116). The Mages were accompanying the king everywhere. Cambodia let the Mages enter the royal court (Young, 1385, 46). The guarding of Cyrus tomb which was the holiest site of Iranian national heritage, and the coronation place of most of them was under their disposal (Shahbazi, Bitai:412). Cyrus appointed the Mages to the position of the guardian of the religion in the Persian empire. The mages were the guards of Darius’ tomb and the fire temple and ... . gizenfon knew them as the religion guardians all over the empire and Istrabon knew them as the Persians (Wishofer, 1389: 92). The Persians were religiously under the authority of the Mages (Mashkor, Bitai, 23). The religion of Zoroaster developed in the last years of the Cyrus’ ruling the Mages became important ( the same: 34). The totem of the Achaemenids was the large-winged eagle, and the Mages due to their respect to the Achaemenids preserved their eagle's flag and preserved them in Ferwaha’s form known as Ahuramazda (Razi, 1385: 64 – 65).thus, the religion of the Mages was equal to the religion of the Persians (Darmester, 1382: 196).

After Cyrus and Cambodia, the position and influence of mages increased. Unlike Herodotes’ narratives, the documents reveal that the Mages were also active in Darius 's era. Herodotes refers to the slaughter of the Mages at the time of Darius, but his narrative is probably constructed by his misconceptions about the killing of the Mage Gaumates... (Schwartz in Dehbashi, 1388: 822). As the Herodotes narrates the Mages were among the permanent members of the Achaemenids’ royal court (Schwartz in Dehbashi, 1388: 825). Therefore, the Darius’ Mage-killing view must go under question (Dandamaif, 1386: 336). Darmester, Bartolde, Maraguradt and Messina also said that there were no hostile relations with the mages either on the part of Darius and the later kings, and the Mages were of particular importance in the Achaemenid court ( ibid: 336). "At the beginning of Darius 's reign, the Mages played an important role in king 's court and lived in the capital of Takht-e Jamshid and ... and in takht-e Jamshid, the Mage is seen in the state of prayer in the pictures beside Darius .... Darius speaks so much about his killings but he does not refer to the killing of the Mages; hence, the Herodotes and Katias view about the killing of the Mages has not occurred in reality” (Dandamaif, the same: 204). Darius not only had no opposition with the Mages but also he united with them in the fight against the common enemy. Calling the Medes’ rebels as liars and Devil by Darius corresponds with calling the Medes as Demon in Wandidad. “Darius 's criminal code is probably the foundation of his book – Wandidad the anti - dave act ... “(Cook , 1383: 137).

Herodotus says: Astiag razed the Mages out. The Mages recommended to the King that Cyrus leave the court, and some of the Mages had relations with rebels and Persians and those Mages had a special respect in court of Cyrus the Second and Cambodia (Diakonof, Cambridge, 1387: 175). Therefore, the Mage-being of Median Gaumates is out of the question because of the hostility of the Mages with the Medes in conjunction with Cyrus and their respect at the Persians Court, since the Mages would have been suppressed if the Gaumates revolt had been the revolt of the Mages, instead of having status at the Persian court.

On the one hand, Dandamaif questions the Mage - killing, on the other hand, he introduces the Gaumates uprising as the Mages-Zoroastrianism uprising. To solve the conflict, it should be accepted that the Gaumates uprising was not the uprising of the Mages because if it was the Mages uprising, Mage - killing would not be unexpected that Dandamaif himself challenged it and it was impossible for the Mages to find such a position in Persian royal court. On the one hand, it is unreasonable that Darius be the suppressor of the Mages uprising, and on the other hand, the crushed Mages took over such a status in Darius court. The revolt had nothing to do with Mages, but it was a national Median uprising and was introduced as from part of the Mage to humiliate the Mede. As Diakonof says, the word of the Mage reveals the aspect of hostility or contempt. As based on Omsted, Darius has introduced Gaumates as the Mage which makes the story readable by choosing the role of Majos (Boyce, 1375, 130). Darius also knew well that Gaumates and his rebellion were not the Mages uprising, and he knew well about the hate of the Medes towards the Mages so as to introduce the murdering of the Mages as the murdering of the Mages and not to cause further riots from the side of the Medes. Thus, there is a paradox in Dandamaif's view that one side consider the revolt as the action of the Mages, and on the other hand, he rejects the theory of Mage-killing. If the rebellion was actually the action of the Mages, there is no doubt Darius as their defeator has done some killing of them.

If the Mage-killing was not involved, why would it remain so much in the memory? Refer to the subject of Mithra: spring or fall - that Mehregan is a Median celebration in the spring, and it was transferred to the autumn as the result of the distortion of the Iranians. The Iranians, as Boyce says, renamed their autumn celebration and called it as Mehregan. We pointed out that the main reasons for the distortion of Mehregan, from spring to fall, were political so that they would turn the day of the Median failure as the day of their defeat and the day of their defeat as their own victory day. It means that most of the Medes uprisings and victories were in the spring and at the time of Mehregan festival taken from the victory over Assyria to Gaumates revolt, and on the days of the Persians triumph over the Medes taken from Firidon victory over Zahak to Darius' victory over Gaumates and "Zou over Afrasiab were in the autumn. Even the victory of Kubat over Mazdakian was at Mehregan festival, as Darius murdered Gaumates at Mehregan (Widdigern, 1377: 425) and also the massacre of the Mazda-kids and the ouster of Zahak took place in Mehregan (Khosrawi, Bitai: 8). According to Be-nonist, Mithra was at the core center of the myths and they could not remove its memory in the minds; instead of destroying it, they turned the celebration from the spring to the fall and from contract to the sun in order to restore the Medes victory as their own - the Persian - victory over the Medes; hence, their (Medes) defeating memory. As a part of his propaganda, Darius established a celebration on the occasion of the killing of a Majos - not the general murder of the Mages - which has been the anniversary of his leaning on power - not the general murder of the Mages (Boyce, 1375: 132- 133).

Marquardt says the Mage-killing is a diversion from the feast of Mithra, "the day of Gaumates death was coincided with the day of the Mithra feast probably on purpose not to have a defensive preparation ... The coincidence of Bagayadish feast with Gaumates killing caused a legend to be created about this this day. The word Bagayada was probably assumed as Mazgati "the day of Mage-killing" (Dandamadaif, 1386: 202). Thus, it is not correct to deny any kind of killing. Darius shifted the memory of the Medes victory from the spring to the autumn and began to introduce murder the Medes deliberately as the killing of the Mages and he turned the victory day over the Mede as the day of their defeat (refer to Mithra/Mehr, Spring or Fall).

All the ancient historians consider the Mages as Zoroastrian, and Zoroaster as the Director of the Mage. the spread of Zoroasterianism has occurred from east - Balkh - to the west. Thus, the Mages were from the east and Iranians that spread to the west and Mede by extending the power of migrant Iranians.

Plato and Plutarch and the ancient authors have known Zoroaster as the Mages and the Mages as a follower of Zoroastrianism (Multon, 1972: 197; Yamochi, 1390: 546). The ancient historians refer to the name of Zarathustra alongside with the name of the Mage. Imanus Marsilunes said about 4 century AC that the Mages have been appointed at the service of the religion and he has written about one century BC that Mages in Pars are regarded as scholars and wisemen and no one would achieve power without receiving the Mages teaching. Nicolas –Damascus Nicola, Qaderi has written about the Damascus city and that Cyrus learned the justice and truth from the Mages and they judged in the courts (PourDavood, Dehbashi, the same: 140). Plato and the rest of the Greeks have known Zoroaster as the developers of the world philosophy and as the first Mage (Yamaauch, 469; boyce, ibid, 261; Pourdavood, 1388: 142). Izboyous and Korgiyoss have considered Zoroaster as the Mage and the king of Balkh ... MusaKhorni has also known Zoroaster as the Mage (the same: 48). Plato sees Zarathustra as the founder of the Mage religion – death: 347 AC - who is the best worshippers of the God and has great thoughts. Anksos and Aristotle also described Zarathustra as founder of the Mage religion that is the most brilliant and useful philosophy (ibid: 152). Lidian Katan-tos who was the contemporary of Herodotus and older than him named Zoroaster Mage (Ali-yev, 1388: 512). In the writings of the authors of the ancient era, Zoroaster has been introduced as a Mage, in the Persian traditions of the middle ages, Zoroaster has also been assumed as from the Mages and the Mages as the followers of Zoroaster" (the same: 458). In the sources of the Islamic ages, Zoroaster has been introduced as the boss of the Mages (the same: 512). If the Mages had been a certain guild or group prior to Zoroaster, they should have been mentioned in Avesta before but they have not been stated in any religious and historical sources before Zoroaster. Thus, the Mages were Zoroastrian (Dandamadaif, the same: 169; Aliyev, the same: 458). Therefore, this assumption that "some know the Mages as from the Mede that opposed the Achaemenid religion is the result of illusion and impossible" (Cristenson, Dehbashi, 861). Moreover, contemporary researchers such as Darnester, Jackson, Messina, Althaim, Cameron, Diakonov and ... have known the Mages as Zoroastrian (Dandamadaif, 1386: 306). Messina rightly considers the Mages as the saint sect, not of the Median tribes; hence, most of them Iranians and fanatic Zoroastrians (Dandamadaif, 1386: 209).

Hertel, Hertsfeld, Konik, Haowitz, Hiozink and Dandamadaif have known the Mages as the enemy of the Zoroasterian religion and the Achamenids of the beginning era as Zoroastrianism (the

same: 307). These scholars believe that the saints are called Atrawans not Mages. However, Darmester, in this case, has explained well that "the Mage is the name of the tribe that all of them were not saints or Kahen???, only those Mages who were saints were known as Atrawan, and the Mage was the name of their race, and Atrawan were the clergies of that clan" (the same: 307). Therefore, "there is no difference between the Mages and Atrawan – Atrawan were the Zoroastrian saints – the Mages were the old name of Atrawan (Aliof, the same: 459). Istrabon also place the Mages among the Persian tribes (Book 15, Chapter 3, Arti-cle 1, quoting from Wishofer, 1389: 166). Benonist quoting Plotarkh and he also quoting Te-opompas the forth century writer as naming the Mazdayasna religion as the doctrine (teach-ings) of the Mages (Benwinist quoting from Reza, 1386: 259 – 260). Therefore, the separation of the Mages from the religion of Zoroastrianism is the construction of modern historians to justify the Zoroastrianism constructed intellectuality which the Mages have distorted it and we will come to the reasons for it in the following.

Further, if we compare the principles and beliefs of the Mages the book Wandidad with eastern Iranian and Zoroastrianism, we will find out their full identity. The eastern Iranians and the Zoroastrians like the Mages instead of buryinh the corpus, they exposed the deads to the birds to eat them. If Zoroaster called the snake as the greatest sin, the Mages knew its killing as the best requital. "The snake was among evil animals and the Zoroastrian priests had an in-strument called snake-catcher or the snakekiller because the killing of the snake was among the good deads (Razi, the same: 180). Herodutes mentioned two actions among the Mages, the first is that they are used to killing all kinds of animals ... the snake and the ants and the reptiles ... and they leave the corpus as the bait prey of dogs and birds. It is not necessary to know much about Zoroastrianism in the ancient testament till we find out that these two things: the killing of the harmful animals and putting the bodies for the prey of the dogs and birds are a sort of Zoroastrianism institutions; hence, many researchers have concluded rightly that the Mages are Zoroastrian (Yung, 1390: 139 – 140). According to Wandida written by the Mages, "there are the holy sites in eastern Iran : Balkh and ... notin the Mede. A chapter in Wandida named a list of the unclen places in which the Mede is one of the"unclean" places and they have known Pars as clean and away from the Demon" ( Razi, 1385: 66). Wandida have taken the Medians gods as among the Devils (te same, 103). The cursed Daws of Wan-did were the Median gods. There was a significant contradiction between the Medians and the Mages gods that after the apparent tendency of the Mages towards te eastern Zarathustra, this enmity continued and the median gods were cursed in Wandid" (the same: 104 -105). If the Mages were from the Mede, why did the Mede become impure and the Pers as pure? and if they were anti - Zoroastrian, why were the burial and their other traditions like snake-killing in the continuation of Zoroastrian religion?

Moreover, the Mages totem was the same as the Persian totem, not the Medes "the Achamanids' totem was the extended-wings eagle and the Mages preserved the Achamanid's eaglebadged flag in the shape of Farwahr known as Ahourmazd due to their respect for the Achaanids (Razi, 1385: 64-65). We have already stated that the bull and the eagle are the totems of the Iranians, and the lion and the snakes are the totems of the Medes that the Mages like Zoroaster also regarded the snake as the greatest enemy and the bull and the fire as sa-cred. The fire was also sacred in the religion of Zoroastrianism and the temple of the Persians; therefore, why does the Median Mages curse the Medan totems and respect the Persian ones?

One of the other reasons that made the scholars regard the Mages as Medians is the word "Ragha" that is introduced in Avesta as a sacred place and the original place of the Mages and Zoroastrian religion. For decades, scholars considered Ragha as Ray, near Tehran, once one of the important cities of Media, and they knew it as the place of the Mages and the sphere of the spread of Zoroastrianism so that it caused the formation of the Median being delusion of the Mages. However, with the new research it became clear that the Zoroastrian sacred Ragha were "not Median Ray,<sup>1</sup> but it is in the east of Iran" (Boyce, 1386: 22). Ragha is not located in the west of Iran, but in the east of Iran (Newly, 1381: 85). Ragha is in Badakhshan (a state in Afghanistan) (Grant in Curtis, 1390: 46). Gerishwich rejects the correspondence of Ragha with Ray of the Middle Ages, as the reference to the Mede has not been invoked in Avesta and he considers the correspondence of Ragha, the center of Zoroasterianism, with Ray and Raga as valueless (Newly, the same: 92). If eastern Ragha is Median Ray, then Yarei-Takna in Sistan is the same with Yarei-Takna, one of the six Median tribes, according to Herodotus, is unfounded (the same: 92). Therefore, the holy Ragha of Zoroasterianism has not the Median Ray, but a place in the east of Iran. The Mages were not Median, but the oriental Persians, and the circle of the priests began in the eastern part of Iran. The development of Avesta was in the eastern part of Iran after the death of the Prophet (the same: 264).

One of the reasons for the formation of the illusion of Mages Median being was the veneration of the Minor Mede by the Mages and their dwelling there which Boyce had some logical explanation in explaining it: "after the conquest of Ray by Macedonians, the Mages went to independent Atropatene and took the religion and fire temple with them and called it Iraniwich ... the Zoroastrian priests (the priests gone there, Qaderi), knew that place as the place of Zoroastrianism for their own benefit. Therefore, the priests dwelling in the Mede, identified Ragha as Ray" (Boyce, 1386: 27 – 29). As the Parthians in the competition with "Azar Gosh-sab" made "Azar Barzin-e Mehr" as sacred, and in the face of the Kaykhusraw epic, they made the Wishtasib legend in Azar Barzin-e Mehr. Like Shah Abbas, who encouraged the pilgrimage of Mashhad in competition with the Arab holy places (the same: 32 - 33), the Mages inhabited in the Mede made the Minor Mede as the holy Zoroastrian shrines; hence, the illusion of the Zoroastrian being of the Medes as well as the illusion of the Median being of the Mages were formed. It seems the dwelling of the Mages in Minor Mede, in contrast to Boyce's view, had some reasons beyond the attack of Alexander and before Alexander. Since Alexander attacked Iran from the west, the Mede, the east was a safer place for the Mages. The Mages' residence in the Mede was in order to spread the religion of Zoroastrianism on the basis of the Achaemenid policy and for the annihilation of Mithra; he was also an appointed Atropan (the guardian of the fire) along with the Persian governor in the Mede. It was exactly like today's Persian/Shiite dispatched governors and saints in Kurd/ Soni region and the building of the fireplaces was similar to the construction of today's Hossainids to preach the politics and the religion of the state as I stated before.

In the meantime, in line with the Persian plundering of the Medes, the aristocrats and the Persian troops later conquered much of the fertile lands in the Minor Mede and Atropan dynasty, the royal family of the religious Iranian, scholars had power in their control in Minor Mede. Because of the fertility of that place and the Mages establishment there, the myth of the Median being of the Mages was formed. "At the time of Shapoor, people considered the Median

country as the country of the Mages because it had the fertile estates in which the Mages lived" (Kristeiansin, 1378:83).

Thus, Ragha as the location and the origins of the Mages was in the East, not the Median Ray. But then, Pahlavi texts introduced Ray as Ragha and transferred the geographic horizon of Ragha to the West and the Median land; apart from the Mages competition we mentioned above, there existed other specialistic reasons for this issue. As the concept of the Iranwicheh was a fictional concept that each time the Persians occupied and inhabited each place by force of the sword, they named that place as Iranwicheh; hence, the name of Ragha was later named after the spread of the Zoroastrian priests to the West. Ray, "Epro - Wimna" was translated as "the sharp doubts," meaning that in spite of the intense publicity of the Zoroastrianism/Iranians among the Median people, and moving a great deal of the temples to the Median land just to impose the Zoroastrianism on the Mithraist Medes, the Medes were in great doubts about Meherless (Merciless) Zoroastrianism. The priests molded Ragha as Ray so that the eastern part of the Mede was the cultural boundary of the lands which was later captured by the Persians, it was the boundary between Mazdayasians and non-Mazdayasians which due to the molding of Ray to Ragha, the Medes showed doubt and disbelief towards Mazdayasians. On the other, the priests attempted to impose the Mazdayasian creed on Diwisnan (Mitra) and destroy the traces of the Medians ritual. Therefore, the Zoroastrian Ragha, not the Median Ray was also a city in East Iran where it was the place of the development of the Zoroastrian religion. For this reason, the Mages rose from there as the Zoroastrianism priests and they came to the west and center of Iran alongside with the expansion of the Iranian power. The mages were the carriers and the loyalists of the religion of Zoroaster. If a change has occurred in the religion of Zoroaster, it was not because of the distortion of Zoroastrianism, or due to their own personal inclinations, but it was as a means of advancing the religious policy of the Achaemenid in which the Mazdayasism development itself became the basis of the Persian Empire (Newly, the same: 268). As the transformation of Islam was due to its spread and the logic of power in which the clergies interpreted it as based on the need of the day rather than knowingly distort it. The formation of Zoroastrianism heritage was in coordination with the demands of the religious policy of the court by the Mages (the same: 264). The expansion of Mazdayasism is determined through the strengthening of the position of the Mages in Iran and Iranian lands (the same, 28). As Jay Messina said and has admitted, the Mages were the pupils of Zoroaster (cited in Newly, the same: 266). Zoroaster pioneered the Mages association at the age of 44 two years after Goshtasib's conversion to his religion where the main message of Zoroaster became official (Shahrwini, Dehbashi, 1388: 758).

In Avesta, the term "Maga" has come to mean the secret society as based on Goldner and Bartoloma. Goldner knows the word "Maga" in Gots as the same "Mage" (Razi, 1385: 93). Zoroaster himself named the friends of his own religion society as "Magon" – the Mages (Razi, 1380: 196). The word "Moghu" has come in Avesta. There are some other words with the same roots of this word in Gots. In Yasna 29, piece 11 the word "Maga" has come (Pourdawood, Dehbashi, 1388: 139 – 140). PourDawood does not consider the Avestan word "Maga" the same as Magos (the Mage) and he knows the Sanskrit word "Magha" to mean "affluence" (the same) which is not correct since if the Avestan word "Maga" means wealth rather than the Mage, then the fellowships of the religion society of Zoroastrianism have been fortunemakers, and in addressing the Mage in Bistoun inscription, Daruis meant the fortune-maker not a

religious person as the Mage has been utilized as Mogu in the inscription which is more similar to Avestan "Moghu" rather than the word Magos "the Mage". so , instead of the useless creations of the Iranians and the Pan- Aryan Iranians authors who try to interpret Avesta internally so that they assume the word Mage as different with the original Mages. As Goldner has pointed out we must admit that the word Mage in Avesta intends to mean the same famous Mages that were the first group of saints and from the first followers of Zoroastrianism.

All the historians and also the Mages themselves emphasize on the Zoroastrian being of the Mages and it is so obvious that all the principles, religion and the history of the Zoroastrian religion is due the Mages. However, why do the western researchers and Iranian imitators insist on showing the Mages as the enemy of the Zoroastrian religion?

This question can be answered through the paleontology of the rules governing the Iranology/Zoroastriology discourse of Western scholars and the theorists of the Arya race. This was a sort of the discourse that constructed Iran land and its components, Cyrus of the human rights and intellectual Zoroaster none of which had any reality. It was a kind of plural Iran constructed and introduced as the cradle of civilization and human rights and enlightenment by anti - Semitic researchers in the 18th century that we will study it in subsequent chapters (the science of history, Iranology and Kurd historiography).

What we tried to show evidence for in the stated materials:

1. The Mages were neither Median nor anti-Zoroastrianism, but the Persians and the original carriers of the Zoroaster religion.
2. Gaumates was not a Mage but an anti-Mage and thus an anti - Zoroastrianism man, and Darius named and introduced Gaumates as the Mage just to distort history and to humiliate him as well as to humiliate the subsequent insurgent so as to believe that they would not revolt in defence of a Mage.
3. Gaumates destroyed the temples of the Iranians, the temples that could not be anything except the Zoroastrianism fire temples. Hence, Gaumates had comprehensively attacked the basis of the Iranian civilization and empire.

By exempting the taxes and military service, Gaumates weakened the basis of the government and the Persian empire. By taking the property of the nobility and giving it to the common people, he targeted the foundations of the Persian government and the structures of the Persian society, and by destroying the Persian fire temples, he attacked the basis of the Iranian religion and ideology. Although we don't have any documents, it is probably due to the Median being of Gaumates, he was Mithraist and he was the one who tried not only to avenge the Medes from Persians but also to revenge the ritual of Mithra from Zoroastrianism. The destruction of Zoroastrianism fire temples cannot have any other reason than his being a Mithraist, as the collapse of the class structure and his division of the property has a Mithraist spirit. Darius probably noticed that with all the forgiveness he had for all other faiths that came from his religious policy, he did not leave behind even a Mithraist trace in all Media and Iran with all of the power. Darius devoted the religious strictness to the peace of his empire and he knew that all were not Zoroastrian (Hints, 1386: 370). With all their political cleverance, the

Achamanid kings were not tolerant at all with the Mithraism ritual and the Medians. “The tolerance of Darius was up to the boundary of ideas which was reasonable to him, beyond that and contrary to Zoroastrianism was forbidden; this point was true about Anahita and Mithra; Darius acted harshly against them especially Mithra, he forbade the bloody sacrifice and the drunkening Hom. It is wonderful to see that there does not exist even one Mithraist temple all over Iran. Apparently, Darius destroyed all of the Mithraism temples, even the Mithrophile Ardeshir did not build a temple or monument for Mithra (Hints: the same).

Therefore, against Gaumates' action in the destruction of Zoroastrian fire temples, Darius in unity with Zoroaster made Ahormazd more prominent in such a way that Dandamaif says he repeated the Ahormazd name for 69 times in Bistoun description and there he re-garded all his and Pars success due to the grace of Ahormazd. Further, destroying all the works of Zoroastrianism and distortion of Mehregan festival from spring to fall caused the spread of zoroastrian-ism and the Mages and the development of Zoroastrian fire temples. Today, there are at least twenty places in Persia where there was a fire temple at Darius time and there was held a religious prayer (Hints, the same: 368)”, and it is more likely that Gautama Zoroaster named and mentioned as an enemy to be the same Gaumates. The name of Darius - Aryawehomna- meaning someone who supports good faith is a Zoroastrian word. The will of Darius on his tomb or epitaph is Darius is totally based on the goodness and evil of Zoroastrianism (Hertsfied. Hekmat, Bit: 79). Yasna's words are similar in the expression of Ahormazd and truth and ... with the words of Bistoun inscription (Zarinkoob, Dehbashi, 1388), in general, the religion of Bistoun inscription is very similar to the Zoroastrian religion (Gimen, 25). None-theless, this fact, that why Darius has not mentioned the name of Zoroaster in the inscription and he has considered himself directly as the representative of Ahormazd, should be answered with the help of Iranian myth since there is no boundary between Iranian ancient history and the Iranian myth in the vacuum of the historical data to prove or reject it which we will come to answer it in the following section (Rostam and Isfandiar); thus, we will provide more evidence for the Mithra-ism being of Gaumates and his uprising.

#### Ferhorthish and Chisertokhma

After killing Gaumates at the hands of Darius and other Persian aristocrats, all of the nations under the Persian domination revolted against Darius and in defence of Gaumates and his actions. “The rioting leaders put the names of the kings on themselves that had been removed by Cyrus, i.e. restarting the local rebellion processes and putting an end to the Achamanids ruling (Bryan, 1380: 182 – 183). “The harshest uprising was that of Ferhorthish from Diako's dynasty trying to recreate the Mede monarchy. He had in mind to renew the Mede government” (Yung, 1385: 68). The Ferhorthish uprising was in the same place where Bardia was killed and it was to revenge the Persians and putting them under pressure” (Aliev, 1388: 467). “The aim of (Ferhorthish) uprising was to renew the apparatus of the time of false (fake) Bardia” (Diakonov, 1388: 400). The uprising turned into the people movement.

Darius the first has said in the Bistoun inscription that the brave people of the Mede that were gathering in groups became Ferhorthish followers (the same: 400). “There is no doubt that common people of the Mede were in line with Ferhorthish uprising; thus we can not cast doubt on the general and national aspect of the uprising against Darius” (the same: 401; Aliev, the same: 466). Darius adds in the continuation that the Persian brave people were serving me, that



is, the same kingdom and class corp were at my service and the army of the people were at the service of the rebellious group. Ferwartish movement were the most serious movement extending up to the Partha and with the suppression of the riot, the hopes to revive the Mede empire was lost (Cook, Cambridge, 1387: 257). The uprising of the Mede was more prominent and it had a more strategic significance; the head of the uprising in Sagartia introduced himself like Ferwartish as from the Howkhshatra dynasty and Daruis called the uprising of Partha – Hirkania as the fans of Fe-rawartish. The uprising kings against the domination of Iran/Pers related themselves to the prior kings of the Mede; meanwhile, the uprising corps were from the common masses of the people and the corps of Daruis were government military forces; hence, this results in this fact that the previous kings of the Mede had legitimacy and the Persian kings had illegitimacy among people. Therefore, the ideology of the divine rights of the kings and their metaphysical legitimacy was developed in the non-existence of their popular legitimacy among the people.

The lengthening of the battle in Armania was not unrelated to the uprising in the Mede. Daruis had found the danger of the Mede out well; thus, he sheltered in the Mede to repel the attacks. It is due to the Mede uprising that Herodotus emphasized on the Mede rioting while describing the subjugation of Ikbatan: “Later the Medes were regretting their action and they rioted against Cyrus ...” (Book 1 article 130 and Diodorus Siculus book 11 chapter 6 article 3, quoting from Beryan, 1380: 181). This fact that Herodotus was only aware of the Mede uprising among 19 other ones shows the significance of the Mede uprising (Dandamaiof, 1386: 290). “More than 50 thousand people were killed from the Medes: does this mean the national uprising and the rebellion of the masses?” (Beryan, the same: 183). The fact that Daruis has merely described torturing the leaders of the Mede uprising in Bistoon indicates the depth of his hatred towards Ferawartish and the Medes in such a way that he has tortured him fiercely with his own hands (Aliov, the same: 468).

One of the Diakos called Chiserma rebelled in Mede –part of Assyria in Irbil. Daruis moved Ferawartish with his nose, tongue and ear cut in Hegmataneh to scare the Medes and to remove its old power, then he killed him and they unskinned his colleagues in Hegmatane castle (Yung, 1385: 74 – 75). “Harsh torture of Median Ferwartish and Chisertokhma was not in line with spiritus of Aryan Daruis and he carried out such a torture due to the reason of the extremely great danger of the Mede for the Pers” (the same: 206). Since Chisertokhma wanted to renew the monarchy of diako, he was killed in the same way as Fe-rawartish, and since he rose from the Mede, his body was cut off in Hegmataneh and it was turned around the city and he was hanged up in Irbil” (the same: 76). Daruis states 34425 people killed and 18000 captured regarding his triumph over Ferawartish, but the number of the prisoners has been written as about 108010 people in the Aramic version in Egypt (Cook, 1383: 112). It has been a huge uprising and massacre in relation to those days population. Daruis only sentenced to death the other kings but he himself cut out the ears, the noses and the eyes of Ferwartish and Chisertokhma due to being the Median kings and he unskinned their colleagues” (Yung, 1385: 74 – 75) and he turned it around all over the empire and he killed 34 thousand people and captured 18 thousand” (Cook, 1383: 112). Although “Wahiz-daneh” claimed the right of the Achaemenid princes, he was not tortured like Ferawartish and Chiserma (Yung, the same: 78). There is no doubt that it has been a great war that two ethnic groups of Pers and Mede has had together over sovereignty on the empire (Cook, the same: 112). Daruis entered the struggle

alongside the Persian corps against the Median insurgents (Aliov, the same: 467). The battle with Ferawartish was the most important battle for Daruis since he could not trust in the Medes. Thus, he sent his Median army to fight “Waiz-daneh” and he went to fight Ferawartish with his own Persian corps (Hints, 1386: 186). Although the great people of the Mede were along with the Pers, the existence of the Persian kingdom was a heavy bur-den for the common folks of the Mede (Diakonov, 1388, 406). In ad-dition to his own Persian corp, Daruis had the support of the Persian tribe in massacring the Medes. “The support of the Persian nation had a great impact on his victory since they did not want to lose the concession of the ruling nation and the exemption of the taxes” (aliov, the same: 468). Thus, tyranny, hatred and the massacre of the Medes was not only the government problem but also the problem of the whole Persian tribe. As, according to Herodutes, all the Asian nations mourned over the death of Gaumates except the Pers. That is, all the Persians people from aristocrats up to the folks supported Daruis in against the Medes and all were happy from killing the Medes and from merciless being and tyranny of Daruis in this concern. Despite the view of some historians like Danmadaif, the rebellion of “Waizdanta” was not a Persian uprising but as Maraquradat indicated rightly, it was the uprising of the migrants and Outies living in Pers. For this reason, Da-ruis separated Outies and the follwers of Waizdane from the Pers after suppressing “Waizdaneh”. As the result, the folks of the Persian people also supported the suppressions of Daruis against other nations.

Shiling says: If we want to know the history of a country, we must know the myths of that nation, it is the myth that shapes the history of a nation and the reverse. This statement of Shiling is more evidential about the history of Iran. Iranians claim to have a serveral thousand history and they absolutely mean the myth by history. The Name (Kings letter) of Ferdawsi known to the philosophy of the land of Iran is nothing more than the narration of Pisdadian and Kianian myths. The metaphysical/religious mentality of the Iranian removes every kind of historical reasoning and casaation and the history narration changes into the form of the history myth. As Wikander says the historical characters and narration has been shaped in the myths (Wikander quot-ing from Newly, the same: 23). “The national stories of Iran does not exist in Shah Name and other inventive and innovative heroism, but they have a historical base becoming storical through the passage of the time (Safa, 1384: 393). Thus, to know the pre-written history of a na-tion, the myths of that nation must be known; those myths which has passed through the filter of the dominant and saints mentakity so as to reach us in today’s form. Kianians and Achamanids

There are different viewpoints regarding Kianians and their relations with Achamanids: some researchers like Hertil and Hertsfield and to a large extent Noldeka believe in the sameness of Kianians and with Achamanids, and KayKhosraw and Goshtasib with Cyrus and Wishta-sib – Cyrus’ father; some others like Kristensen and Henning have an opposite view and they regard Kianians as the eastern kings belonging to Kharazm which was occupied by Cyrus the great. But unless the opposing reasons having been expressed, we can easily accept that Wishtasib was the supporter of Zoroaster (Newly, 1381: 22). As Fry has indicated, mentioning the name of Wishtasib among the Kianians kings reltes all the kings of this dynasty to the history (the same: 22). Our hypotheses is that Kianians are the same as Achamanids and even if their names was related to the eastern myths and they might be the Medians, their actions are the same as the actions of the Achamanids kings being molded on mythical kings or the names of the eastern kings have been molded on the actions of the Achamanid kings.

“The Iranians myths are divided into four periods; from the ancient times up to Manochahr, from Manochahr up to kayghobad, from kay-ghobad up to Ghoshtasib and from him up the death of Dara. The first two eras are related to the prehistory time but the last two periods are historical in which the third part – from Kayghobad up to Goshtasib – though three kings and names are prehistorical, their actions and deeds are historical, and from Goshtasib up to Dara both their kings and their actions are historical” (Pirnia, 1383: 91 – 92). The periods we will come to it start from bi-parting Kianians from Lohrasib up to Isfandiar which its historical form is from Arsham to Daruis and it is the period which includes from Zoroaster uprising up to his death while struggling with Arjasib who is the same Gaumates and Ferawartish

Kianian dynasty initiated with the kingdom of Kayghobad. The first mentioning of Kayghobad is in Yasht-e 13 in which after stating the names of Pishdadian, his name stands at the top of the list of the Kian-ians (Rezai, 1384: 47). Based on the words of Banhesh, Ghobad a child put in a box and left in the water was found by “Ouzoo” and he adopted him as his child (the same: 48). Kay kowad in Chehrdad, Nisk- e Dinkard -, Book 18, chapter 13, article 12 – from the generation of Manochehr, the pioneer of Kianian dynasty is nice and the cause of prosperity... OUzoo, the last king of Pishdadi adopted him as his child .... Kowad in the river water ... Ouzoo brought him up... the point of this story is the finding of a forsaken child who is the pioneer of a kingdom dynasty from the time of Sargon in 2800 BC up to Mo-ses and Romolos and ... Cyrus and ...” (Cristensen, 1343: 106 – 108). “Kayghobad had a son called KayApiwa and from KayApiwa four child, that is, from KayKawis, Siwash and from Siawash Kaykhosraw was born... but the other dynasty of Kianian dynasty are from the generation of “KayPisin” another son of KayIpiwa” (Rezai, the same: 48). The big branch of the Kianians ended up with KayKhosraw and the other branch of it set on the throne not from the Kay Kawes decent but from KayPisin dynasty ... Also the big branch of Achaemenid kings came to an end with the death of Cyrus and kingdom went to the branch of Daruis and .... Therefore, in case Kaykhosraw is Cyrus, Kaykawes is the same Cambodia the father, and KayGhobad is also Chishpish ... which apparently the capital came to Pers along with Kayghobad.

Kaylohrasib can be AryarMena or Arsham, Sipandad also Daruis, Bahman also Khashayar. Kayghobad settled down in Istakhr-e Pars and he, who was on the verge of defeat, requested to make peace with Afrasiab (the same: 50). Perhaps moving the capital to Pers by Kayghobadbis a signal of the Perses migration from the east to the Pers. The peace is also an indication of accepting the domination of the Medes and Howakhshatra. “Kayghobad replaced the decents of Cyrus who had ruling in Pers and they were the subordinates of Asyria or the Mede... it means that their names was forgotten and their place was taken by storical

Kayghobad ... the control of the Cyrus decents is at the hands of the heros, the decents of Cyrus were the subordinates of Asyria or the Mede in history, too. The center of the kingdom was transferred from the north to the south, and the ruling center is moved from Achaemenid to Pers in history, too. He replaced several kings in the time of his 120-year kingdom ... ChishPish, Cambodia, Cy-rus... From this person onward, Achaemenid were divided into two parts Aryarmana, from one part, and Cyrus the second, from the other hand ... which is in line with the lists given by Ferdawsi ...

First was Kawes with greating  
forth name was Kayarmin

Kiarash was the second, the third was KayPishin The  
They spent the world in a convenient way

کیارش دوم بد سوم کی پشین نخستین چه کاوس با آفرین  
سپردند گیتی به آرام و کام چهارم کی آرمین کجا بود نام

Cambodia corresponds with Kaws, Cyrus with Kiarash, Chaishish with Peshin and Aryarmana with Armin in line with history. According to the story, Kayghobad 140 years after Manoochehr ... if we lessen 140 from 871 in the beginning of Manoochehr kingdom, it becomes 730 which is the beginning of Achaemenid ruling in Pers" (Pirnia, 1383: 125 – 128). Therefore, "They related the actions of the Median and Achaemenid kings to the story kings ... Kianians have replaced Achaemenids and the names of the first kings have been forgotten up to Goshtasib but their works which have been perienial have been related to the story kings ..." (the same: 12). There is no sign of Lohrasib in Avesta. There is just once the name of Lohrasib mentioned in Avesta and in AbanYasht paragraph 105 and in reference to Goshtasib the son of Lohrasib (Noori, 1380: 167). Apparantly, Lohrasib has lacked the title of being king in the ancient history and today's stories regarding his being king are the later forms of his fate to fill up the time vacuum between KayKhosraw and Goshtasib (Rezai, the same: 64).

Lohrasib is the same Aryarmane or Arsham who was not a king. Daruis made some scribbles for the sake of his legitimacy and made them as the king ... the history also has not mentioned anything about the king being of Aryamene. As the king being of Lohrasib is a later form constructed, the kingness of Aryamene and Arsham is also a later form constructed by Daruis to give legitimacy to his own dynasty. Thus, we get to these results that in the same way of the constructed text of the inscription instead of history, this is Daruis ideology for legitimacy and they are the Iranian myths constructed by the politics system in the direction of distorting the reality. Even if the myths have been originated from the unconscious mind of the people, the ruling apparatus (Daruis order and the art of the Mages) have distorted it and they have constructed it based on their own policy; thus the myths are the same ideologies of the old communities in giving legitimacy. Specially, the story of the two kingdom dynasties, that the historians have known Daruis to be its makers, has been totally challenged; nonetheless, we see that the lies of Daruis have shaped the bases of the Iranian myths. Thus, there should be considered the relation of the content of the myths with the intention of its author and with the political and religious context in which the "we"/ the other of the myths are a reflection of the "we"/ the other of Pers/Zoroaster, i.e. the Mede/Mithra and the myths are the hegemonic instrument of the Pers domination in giving legitimacy to itself and rejecting and cursing the other/ the Mede.

In myths, there were two of the Kaykawos nephews in the court of Lohrasib. Because Lohrasib paid much attention to them, he ignored bringing his sons up well. Goshtasib got disturbed from this ignorance and he cut off with the father and went to Rome, he married Katayoun the Caser's daughter. Lohrasib recalled and crowned him and he himself got to pray (the same: 65). Kaykawos' nephews are the same Cyrus the first's nephews – Cyrus the second and ... which had the main power of Achaemenid in their disposal. The worrying of Goshtasib in the myths is the reflection of the same worrying of Goshtasib the father of the historical Daruis. Goshtasib is probably sad and distressed since his father Aryarmene did not rule like Lohrasib in myth and he has given the power to his cousin – Cyrus. As the Cyrus dream signaling Daruis gaining power indicates the competition of these two cousins, it is likely that this has not been a mere

dream and Cyrus has seen or heard some kinds of plots from cousins that have been reflected in the dream... Thus, Perhaps Goshtasib and Cyrus along with Daruis have been thinking of a conspiracy to regain their family power in Achamanids. They constructed the myths of the kingness of Arsham and Aryarmene – Lohrasib for the sake of giving legitimacy to it and canceling their usurp. It is possible that the marriage of goshtasib with a Roman be the result of his willing exile or becoming the eastern governor (Satrap) under the Cyrus decree. Greshwiche knows Achamanid Wishtasib as the one who returned to Iran from the battle field of Cyrus with Masajets to attend to the situation of his son being suspicious of conspiracy. This was as the result of the rapid reflection of Zoroastrian teachings which daruis has learned them while he was young (Greshwiche quoting from Newby, the same: 16).

The actions of KayKawos is historical like Cambodia... Cambodia is selfish, capricious and ... like KayKawos. The campaign of Hamawaran is the same campaign of Cambodia to Egypt ...” (Pirnia, the same: 128 -129). “KayKawos campaign to the north and Mazandaran is the same suppression of riots by Cambodia. Cambodia was busy suppressing the rebels during three years. As we said before the historical Cyrus is the same mythical Kaykhusraw. The reason behind the transfer of historical Cambodia who is after Cyrus to mythical Kawos who is before Kaykhusraw is that Cyrus father’s name was Cambodia and Cyrus son had the same name which later both became one and through changing two people into one name, it is natural that ancestor precedes the nephew... Cambodia is selfish, capricious and ... like KayKawos... and in the same time, he had a strong spiritus” (Pirnia, the same: 128 -129). Therefore, the historical Cambodia is the same as the mythical Kawos. This point that the monarchy goes to the other Kianian dynasty after Kaykhusraw in the myths is the reflection of the same history that gets to the Achamanid dynasty after Cyrus.

Lohrasib – AoroAsip- is the same Arsham, the son of Aryarmene and the nephew of “ChaishPish”. Aryarmine has become Armin (the same: 142). “The transfer of the kingdom has been to the lateral branch of Achamanid, i.e. Daruis not Lohrasib. It is Lohrasib in the story ... since if the Mages had named Daruis directly, Goshtasib would have been deprived from the historical monarchy; thus, they did not want to omit such a supporter of Zoroaster and not consider him as the king” (the same: 143). As the result, the kingness of Lohrasib and Goshtasib, the ancestors of Daruis/Isfandiar was constructed in the myths similar to the historical lies of the king being of Arsham and Aryamene. Daruis included them among the kings to give legitimacy to himself even though he is Daruis is the mediator of the transfer of power to his own dynasty. The mythical narration has also quoted the same history with this difference that it is not the history but the myths which have their own logic. Therefore, the Persian myths have been constructed not from the realities of history but the historical lies. Both history and myths are the constructed narrations of the kings like Daruis in giving legitimacy to himself and negating the other; this is the relation of the text with the intention of its narrator and its political function. In case the mythical Goshtasib is the same historical Wishtasib and Isfandiar, as Hertel and Hertsfield have said, the same Daruis, Arjasib and Rostam can not be anyone but Gaumates or Ferwartish.

Hertel, Hertsfield and Althaim regard the Avesta Goshtasib as the historical Goshtasib, that is, Daruis’ father. The story goes that Goshtasib as one of Cyrus’ preachers has made some relations with Zoroaster in east and he has promised to spread Zoroastrianism with the help of the kingdom power after accepting it. In return, Zoroaster has given religious sacralty and

legitimacy to the king being of Goshtasib. It is likely that Goshtasib as the preacher of Cyrus and being in contacts with Zoroaster has had some plots to transfer power to his own dynasty that it has been manifested in the form of complaints to Lohrasib, his father that why he obeyed his cousin and the Cyrus family. Lohrasib prefers the other children of Kianian dynasty, i.e. his cousin to Goshtasib con-notating Insraf from power in favour of Cambodia the first or Cyrus the first. Ghahr Kardan-e Goshtasib and being far away from the capi-tal is an indication of Goshtasib going from Pers to the east and Balkh. He went there to apparently serve Cyrus but, in fact, to carry out his own plans and it was there he became acquainted with Zoroaster. In campaign towards the east and Masajests, Cyrus noticed some conspiracies from behalf of his cousins, Goshtasib and Daruis. Cyrus returned Goshtasib back to Pers to punish and make sure of Daruis who, according to Greshwich, found ground there to become acquainted with Zoroastrianism. Zoroaster only knew Goshtasib as the official king of his religion. However, since Cyrus has the power and legitimacy in his disposal, the eastern mages took Cyrus – KayKhosraw to the time before Zoroaster and Goshtasib not to develop gaps in the kingdom and truth of Goshtasib. While Cyrus/KayKhosraw is at the same time of Zoroaster, KayKhosraw was taken back before Zoroaster in myths to recognize Goshtasib as the king spreading Zoroastrianism. Nevertheless, since Cyrus/KayKhosraw had an important role in spreading Zoroastrianism against Mithra, he has been described as Zoroastrian even before Zoroaster. The role of Daruis or Goshtasib is clear in which they took back Cyrus before Zoroaster corresponding to taking KayKhosraw back before Zoroaster just to give legitimacy to their own family as the original Zoroastrian king and the initiator of the holy or sacred history.

The Mages and Zoroaster took the opportunity to incite Goshtasib in the struggle against blasphemy after exiting Cambodia out of the country and Gaumates coup. As the Mages and Zoroaster still considered Goshtasib as the real king, they knew his distance from the Pers as the distance from the capital; hence, in his absence, the Torania Arjasib assaulted the capital and killed Lohrasib. At the time of Arjasib assault to Goshtasib, at the start there was no news about Isfandiar and it is for the struggle with Arjasib that Isfandiar entered the scene. At the beginning there is no news of Daruis struggling against Gaumates in history, “Lying became common in the country, there was nobody facing the mage till I – Daruis – arrived”. Goshtasib pledged Isfandiar the kingdom as the result of defeating Arjasib. It is possible that Goshtasib promised Daruis the kingdom on the condition of defeating Gaumates who had destructed the Zoroastrian temples and the enemy of Zoroaster since he could not do anything against Gaumates and Daruis had one thousand army in his disposal. There was also the competition between Goshtasib and Daruis so as Goshtasib promised Daruis in case he defeated Gaumates, he will receive the crown that he perhaps did not think Daruis would succeed. In the same way that the mythical Goshtasib did not think that Isfandiar would succeed in the fight against Rostam. Daruis succeeded and gained legitimacy and Goshtasib was ... from the throne and crown for ever at first by his cousins and later by his own son.

However, despite Daruis kingdom why Goshtasib became the king and Daruis is removed in the myths? The answer is directly related with not mentioning the name of Zoroaster in the inscription of Daruis. The secret behind not mentioning the name of Zoroaster in the inscriptions by Daruis and introducing himself directly as the representative of Ahourmazd lies in this. In spite of the view of some researchers, it was not the result of not Zoroastrian being of Daruis but the result of the completion of Daruis and Goshtasib the father, who was beloved by the Mages and Zoroaster, over the throne. Despite the promise that Daruis had given, he was

not ready to dispose of the throne to Goshtasib the father after the victory. Thus, Zoroaster and the Mages, who considered Goshtasib as the beloved Zoroastrian king, are not ready to sanctify and accept Daruis as the good religion king. For this reason, they do not mention the name of any king after Goshtasib in religious narration and the sequence of the kings ended with Goshtasib in the religious narration. To confront them, Daruis did not state the name of Zoroaster in the inscription and he directly considered himself as the representative of Ahormazd just to get Zoroaster around. His propaganda regarding the killing of Mages and introducing Gaumates as the Mage was not only to inferiorate the Mages but also to humiliate the Mages and warn them. For this reason, Isfandiar is killed by Rostam in *ShahName* (the letter of the kings) while Daruis was going on in history. Isfandiar was killed by Rostam in *ShahName* (the letter of the kings) since the source of Ferdowsi's information was not the history but the myths. Moreover, Daruis was removed from being the king as the result of disobeying Goshtasib; hence, Ferdowsi brought the struggle between Isfandiar and Rostam to an end through the death of Isfandiar, which we will come to it in the following. In *Farwardin Yasht*, Zoroaster speaks about a person named Gaumates who is a deceiver (ZarinKob, 52). It is most likely that the deceptor Gautama whom Zoroaster speaks about him is the same

Median Gaumates. Article 16 of *Farwardin Yasht* "It is as the result of their glory that a wise man would be born .... To defeat Gaumates". Pourdawood says: Gautama is represented as the rival of Zoroaster in this article, and there can not be found any name of him anywhere in Avesta. Hog and Darmester has regarded this Gautama as Boda. Ishpighal has known the Gautama of article 16 in *Farwardin Yasht* not a specific noun but a concrete noun meaning "farmer", Goldner as a member of the clan, Yosty as a concrete noun and as one of the enemies of Mazda Yasna, Til also denies any connection between Avestan Gautama with Boda (Kahlan, 1375: 281). The idol worshipper who Isfandiar fought with him is not a Bodist (Noldeka, 2537: 46). Thus, It is most probable the stated Gautama is the same Gaumates or the false Bardia who was the contemporary of Zoroaster (Kahlan, the same: 281). "Hofman, Hertel, Hauwit and Hertsfeld believe that the incidents related to the kingship of Gaumates have been reflected in Gots. The pieces of 8 and 9 and Yasna 53: Since Wishtasib could not oust Gaumates, Daruis succeeded in ousting Gaumates under the obedience of Zoroaster. Nevertheless, after his success in ousting Gaumates, Daruis was not ready to give the monarchy to

Goshtasib/Zoroaster considering himself as the representative of Ahormazd, Zoroaster's God; thus, in the religious narration of Zoroastrian Mages, Daruis was removed and the kings ended in Goshtasib. "Zoroaster preaching in the northeast of Iran against Gaumates is so obvious in Yasna that Hertsfeld did not see the need to admit or approve it" (quoting from Danmadaif, 1386: 169 – 1

The battle of Isfandiar and Rostam, which we will come to it in the following, is the same battle of Zoroastrian Daruis and Mithraist Rostam symbolizing the struggle of Daruis and Gaumates. "Isfandiar is the commander of the truth corp and he keeps the country and religion safe against the leader of Devil forces, the lie and he defeats the Devil forces" (Maskob, 2536: 34). Daruis also describes the rebels as lie and Devil and he considers himself as the representative of Ahormazd in the struggle with lie in a way he repeated the word lie 36 times and the word Ahormazd 69 times in the inscription.

In the anthology poem of *Yadgr-e Zariran*, the first Iranian epic-mystical poem, there can be seen the story of Arjasib attacking the court of Goshtasib and the confrontation of Zarir, Bistor

then Isfan-diar. The narrative pointed out that due to the admission of the Zoroastrianism at the Wishtasib court, Arjasib warns in a threatening letter that they will be attacked unless they return from the new religion. Neiberg knows Toranian Arjasib as related to the faith of Mithraism (Neiberg quoted from Jami, the same: 630). The contents of the Arjasib letter shows - the threatening letter of washing their hands out of the new religion – that the Iranians and the Toranian had the same religion (the same: 630). We said previously that before 15 Aryans arrival in the east of Iran, the aboriginal of this region were the followers of Mithraism and we even noted that Jamshed's sin has been not doing enough against the Mithraism and bull or cow sacrifice, "perhaps Jam-shid involvement in lies ... was due to his acquaintance with the natives or the Dives (Mirzai, 1379: 132).

Zoroastrianism was not accepted in the Mede, and Zoroaster was forced to flee to the east, where he became acquainted with the missionaries of Cyrus/Goshtasib. With the domination of the Iranian immigrants (Cyrus the Achaemenid), the religion of Zoroastrianism was imposed with the authority of the state which provoked the protest of the natives (the Mithraist Medes). Threatening Goshtasib by Arjasib because of the acceptance of the new religion refers to the Median up-rising of Gaumates and the destruction of Zoroastrianism fire temples which attempted to revive Mithraism in contrast to the newcomer religion of Zoroastrianism. The heroic symbol of the old Mithraism rite and the new comer religion of Zoroastrianism is correspondingly the battle of the old Rostam with the young Isfandiar. Zoroaster was killed in the same wars, in the religious Pahlavian books, Zoroaster would be killed in the war between Arjasib and Goshtasib (Kahlan, 1375: 293). Also in history, after the wars of Darius with the Median rebels, there is no longer any news of Zoroaster, and Hertsfield also sees Zarathustra being killed at the same time. Henning regards the 588 the year of Zoroaster's rising in the age of 30 or 42 becoming the good religion of Wishtasib (Henning, 1364: 94); nonetheless, it seems that due to the presence of Zoroaster in the wars of Darius against Gaumates, the year 588 is the birth year of Zoroaster and the year 558, at the age of 30, is to noutch time of his campaign and the time of his acquaintance with Cyrus or his agent Wishtasib. He died in 522, in the war against the Median Gaumates- which has been reflected in the myths as the war against the Turanian Arjasib - which sought to re-store the Mithraism and destroy Zoroastrianism. Therefore, as indicated correctly by Althighm-Ishtil, Zoroaster's birth year is 598 BC and his death year is 521BC (Wishofer, 1389: 111) the same years of the war with Gaumates.

The subject of Yadgar-e Zarriran about Bestor the son Zarir, Goshtasib's brother is the fighting with Arjasib to avenge his father's killer. According to Benonist, it was originally in poetry (verse) and with additions from Sassanian era, it has become prose and its origin traces back to Ashkani era more in the 3rd century AC. Benonist sees it as an imitation of the poetical story of Zeryders and Odatis that Khars Mitani has narrated (Cristensen, Dehbash, 1388: 658).

Based on Benonist's view Zeryders is the same Zarir and Odatis is the same Ho-teos; this story is related to the Achaemenid period. In contrary to Benonist view, as Cristensen has rightly pointed out: the story of Khars is not related to Zarir, but it is similar to the story of Goshtasib and the daughter of Caesar (the same: 658).

In revenge of his father, Bestor attacked Toranians and killed Derafsh-e Jado (the banner of the magic). At the battle field, Isfandiar appointed him as the commander of that war, and he himself went to the war with the Khiunin Mede (the same: 656). Darius also gave the commander of the eastern front to his father, Goshtasib and he himself went to the main war with the Mede.



"After giving an army to Bestor, he himself went up the mountain to beat Arjasib from above the mountain and to drop him down to the plains.... Sepandat fought and he rode towards Geramic Kert and geramic Kert rode towards Bestor" (Moazin Jami, the same, 657). This point that he drove out of the mountain to the plain pointed out the Mede mountain-that Darius drove Ferawartish from the mountains there to the fields. Sipandat drove towards Geramic Kert and Ouistor, Bestor or the same Goshta-sib refers to the driving of Ferawartish to Parthia and getting to Goshtasib army. Ferawartish fought on two fronts, one in the west with Darius and Yodarnae, and in the east with Wishtasib. As we pointed out Yadgar-e Zarir is not related to Zarir, but he is similar to the Goshtasib story. The original story is about Goshtasib. When Isfandiar drove Arjasib to Bestor, Zarir's son, it means Darius drove Ferawartish towards Goshtasib.

When Isfandiar is in the jail and Goshtasib is away from the capital, Arjasib attacked Balkh and killed Lohrasib and robbed his two daughters. Cambodia is away from the capital and Gaumates married both the wife and daughter of Cyrus. Isfandiar being in jail is the absence of Darius who was accompanying Cambodia in Egypt. Goshtasib, who could not withstand the attack of Arjasib, set Isfandiar free and sends him to the Battle with Arjasib, which is the same request from Darius to return and fight Gaumates.

It has been written in this book: "After killing Zarir, Kay Goshtasib's brother, three of the Iranian heroes claimed manhood; one was Nastor, Zari's son, another was Gerami Kert, Arjasib's son, and Isfandiar who put the foe of Arjasib, the Toran King into a lot of trouble. . They cut one hand, one foot and an ear out of him and they burned one of his eyes to the fire, and they turned him around the city riding on a cut-tailed donkey (Pahlavi text of Yadgar-e Zariran quoted from Moezin Jami, Dehbashi, 1388: 633) . It was exactly like the killing of Ferawartish and Chisertokhmeh by Darius, who took out his ears and nose, and an eye and turned them around all over the Mede.

Isfandiar is also the national hero, who rescued Iran from the devil of the Toranians. He is also the religious hero who spreaded the religion of Zoroaster in Iran and other countries and in every corner of the world brought all the people to the Ahormazd religion" (Safa, 1384: 597). Thus, Darius is both the national hero as well as religious hero, he also saved Iran from the disintegration and he spreaded Zoroastrianism through constructing temples and establishing Ahormazd which repeated it 69 times in the inscription.

Asfandiar followed Arjasib to the Robin Dij, and the story of seven phases of Asfadyar is about the same trip of him. Asfandiar fought with the wolf, the lion, the dragon, and the woman conjurer and phoenix (the same: 597). The pattern of Darius in Persepolis showed him hunting the lion and wolf, and as we said that the lion and dragon were totems and national symbols of the Medes and along with the wolf are the animals always accompanying Mitra. The capture of the Robin Dij fortress by Asfandiar seven phases can be the capture of the Gaumates fortress and killing him with the seven friends of Darius. In addition, phoenix is the friend of Rostam in battle with Asfandiar whom he was also fighting with Rostam in the seven phases.

Arjasib is usually called the king of Khionan from beyond Maverano Anahr, "but since the emergence of this tribe -which have also been called Hiatala and haftalan -in the history of Iran is related to the fourth century AC and relating Arjasib to them should have been done in the Sassanid period (Neghberg, 296) and in the middle of the fighting of Iran with Hyatela in fifth

century AC" (Neighberg, 296, Yarshater, 514 quoting from Moezin Jami, the same: 630). Thus, the eastern be-coming of mythology is the next construction and Arjasib is related to the west.

Wishtasib fought with Koyan and Kerpan, but his greatest campaign was the war with Arjasib the Khoinan. Arjasib asked for tribute from Wishtasib and because Wishtasib rejected this request, the war between them took place in Gorgan the Koms mountain (Cristensen, 1343, 141-142). If the Turanian were eastern and the Iranians were in Balkh, how the war occurred in Gorgan on the western border of Balkh. This region is closer to Rey that is the location of the capture of Farahwartish province, not the east of Iran. Kerpinan are also the same sacrificers that indicates the ceremony of Mithra.

In Yashts and all parts of Avesta, we will encounter a vacuum after the reign of Goshtasib, and there has been done no attempt to fill this gap in terms of political history (Cristensen, 1343: 143). The name of Bahman is mentioned a lot in Avesta (the same: 144). Bahman is the same Khashayar because Bahman has a Jewish woman and he formalized the Zoroastrian calendar. This Khashayar who has a Jewish woman (Safa, 1384: 143). Hamza Ibn-e AlHasan and Mohammad Jezira write: Bahmanok-e Kay Ardeshir took army to Greece while we know that Khashayar did the campaign in Greece (the same: 540). Bahman's woman, based on the narration of Islamic historians, was either Snor or Stor who is the same Ester, Khashayar's Jewish woman that has been referred to in the book of Ester, one of the sacred or holy books of the old testament (the same: 541). Therefore, some of Ardashir's acts and sometimes Cyrus' have been manifested in Bahman's myth, but Bah-man in the myths is meant to be Khashayar king of Achaemenid. The reason why, in the mythology narrative, we fall into a vacuum after Goshtasib till we come to Bahman and the name of Asfandiyar and ... , is deleted" because Darius rioted against Zoroaster and Goshtasib and he called himself directly as the messenger of Ahormazd and he omitted the name of Zoroaster. "Darius called himself as the establisher of godly system, the conflict between Darius and the Mages is not a conflict between the two religions: Darius does not bring a new religion, he does not disturb the gathering of the Mages. The struggle of Darius with the Mages was an effort to make itself known as the religious supreme authority of (Collins in Yung, 1390: 136). Due to the formalization of the religion of Zoroaster and the destruction of the pagan Sistan, who did not bear to convert to the religion of Zoroaster, Bahman had a more acceptance among the cult of Zoroastrianism Mages. The destruction of Sistan, which was uncomparable in the history of Achaemenids, is the destruction of the Dives temples by Khashayar as we have already stated means Median Mithraist temples and works. Bahman also refers to an approach that destroyed Mithraism from the inside, that is, the Zoroastrianisation of Mithra and its transformation of Mitra into sun worshipping which we will continue to discuss below. As we have stated the history has been narrated in the form of myth, and although Kianians origins might have been farther than the rule of the Persians and even they might have belonged to the Medes, the deeds and the names of Kianians have been molded on the Persian kings in Persian narrations and "the other" of the Kianian myth is the same as "the other" of the historical Persian. We have stated that the mythical Asfandiyar is the same historical Darius and his struggle with Arjasib is the same battle with Gaumates. In the absence of historiography in Iran, history has been written in the form of myth and from the filter of the ruling party. Thus, although it (the myth) has narrated the history, it lacks the precision and historic neutrality and it has turned into the form of giving legitimacy to the Persian ideology and power. Therefore, we must analyze the text of the mythology in the political and ethnical context and this matter that who and what side of the

confrontation has written it will help in understanding the meaning of the text. The good illustration of Kianians and the evil representation of Toranians is the definition of one side of the conflict, i. e. the same Persian ruling ethnicity and the cause of good becoming of this and bad becoming of that is the emergence of the Pers as a political power and the deterioration of the Mede and Gaumates. The victor side of this struggle defines himself as good and the other defeated as evil to give legitimacy to his usurpation and domination. Therefore, these myths are not metaphysical but representative of the political order and the mythical knowledge is the lubricant of the wheels of the Persian power. It means that the Iranian reason (in this case myth) is reproducing the Persian sovereignty and the function of this reason is not producing the historical knowledge but the justification and legitimacy giving to the sovereignty.

#### Rostam and Asfandiyar and the deadend of Ferdowsi

The story of Rostam and Asfandiyar is one of the most interesting and controversial stories of the Shahnameh which has not been stated in other Zoroastrianism /Iranian sources whether in Khoday Name (The God letter) or in the texts of the Avesta, whether in the religious narrative or national narrative. The incomparable creativity of Ferdowsi, the professor of speech, has composed it. It is so different from the epic soul and one-sidedness of the Iranian culture and the structure of Shahnameh which a group of researchers have casted doubts on its epic being of that doubt and they have called it a tragedy (Shamisa, 1376: 244) and some have considered it not as the battle between two heroes but as a battle between two old rituals (Dawlatbadi, 1379: 59). Some others have seen it as the transformation and substitution of two cultures (Haidaryan, 1372: 370). Some people also regard it not belonging to the Iranian culture but as a cultural loaning of the Greeks (Bahar, 1384: 444). Here, we will outline the hypothesis that Rostam and Asfandiyar have no differences with the Iranian epic structure in the shahnameh, and the deadend of Ferdowsi in the creation of Rostam ,a hero not existing in no Iranian / Zoroastrianism source - has caused its composition. Instead of getting it to a logical conclusion, Ferdowsi distorts the original story through concealing its cultural battle, that is the struggle between two different rituals and he has made the ill-temper of Goshtasib as the reason for the struggle. On one side, Ferdowsi was facing Asfandiyar who had been eliminated from history in the religious narration, and on the other hand , he constructed a kind of Rostam who is product of his own creativity. With the advent of Zoroastrianism in which they replaced the culture of mysticism and submission with the culture of epic and struggle, there remained no room for Rostam who was the representation of the culture of epic. Therefore, to put an end to this uninvited guest and to continue his poems, he inevitably brought about a struggle between them whose tragic events did not exist in reality but in Ferdowsi 's mind to say goodbye (make a farewell) to the heroes of his story. It is needed to state that the Iranianized Rostam in Shahname is the construction of Ferdowsi's creativity and he did not exist in tragic form but he existed in a Mithra-ist / Median epical feature which we will focus of in the following. The tragedy is hidden in the constructed form of Rostam himself in a way that being Iranian/Zoroastrian has been on him; hence, the tragedy of Shahname is the result of the contrast between the earlier Mithraist Rostam and the later Rostm of Ferdowsi; for this reason, we will call it the deadend of Ferdowsi.

#### Rostam, Iranian or Aniranian ?

Rostam is the full scale pattern of the Iranian intellect that is not Iranian, he is the full scale

Zoroastrian hero who is not Zoroastrian. Rostam is the general pattern of Iranian/Aniranian culture whose origin is Me-dian/Aniranian culture but Iranian coloring has been molded on it. and . rostam is a symbol of iranian / zoroastrian culture . rustam as symbol and symbol of shahnameh , shows the material / material being of shahnameh and its manifestations by iran . the violent struggle of esfandiar with rostam is an example of the brutal treatment and slaughter of bahman by rostam , an echo of the change in the pattern of con-tact with mademoiselle .

Shahname is the whole viewing mirror of the Iranian knowledge and it is the Quran of Ajam (Safa: 138: 215). According to Tabatabai it has laid the foundations of the philosophy of the Iran land history. The foundation of Shahname and its main hero, Rustam-e Dastan, is a symbol of Iranism and the good and Ahoraists forces in fighting evil and demon forces. But was Rustam really Iranian and bound to Iranian culture? " It is interesting that Rustam is remembered as a true Iranian while their ancestors were in the North and they might have been Tu-ranians (Yacob, 1381: 22). In all religious and national sources, both written and oral, there is not the name of Rostam before the Shahnameh."There does not exist the name of Rustam in Avesta ....Rustam is left aside in Pahlavi literature and in Zoroastrian Sasanids literature ... in the Sasanids literature, Gershasib is still a great hero .... Bandhish has named Rustam once" (Bahar, 1384: 227). "The story of Rustam and Asfandiyar, like Rustam and Sohrab, and Bahram-e Chobin ... is an independent story that has been later added to Shahname" (Safa, 1384: 45 ). There is no trace of the story of Rustam and Asfandiyar, the whole Rustam and his heroic acts in Khodainame (the same: 46). There is not the name of Dastan-Zal - and Rustam in the religious narrative (Cristensin, 1343: 191).

The researchers have mentioned some reasons for why Rustam had not been mentioned in Iranian sources. Schpiegel said the authors of Aves-ta knew Rustam but they intentionally did not speak of him because of his unpleasant behaviour. this unpleasant behavior is an echo of his be-ing Zoroastrian / Iranians and his connection with the Mede/Mithra. Hashem-e Razi believes: the names Zal and Rostam have been omitted in the Avestan texts. Without doubt, the prejudice of priests would not allow to name them since this family refused to accept the Zoroastrian religion (Razi, 1380: 438). But Noldeka does not accept this and says that the authors could mention him badly (Safa, 1384: 564). Noldeka's argument seems to be more acceptable since the authors of the Avesta always called their opponents as "demon", lie and "dragon" and if they were acquainted with Rustam and did not conform to their desires, they would have certainly described him with the satanic titles. Of course, he may have been described in this way, but since Ferdawsi later made Rustam Iranian, Rustam's connection with the demonic ti-tles might have been forgotten, which it is not possible to fathom it right now. What is certain is that in all Iranian sources, there is no men-tion of Rustam whether unknowingly or in a hostile way. it is possible , of course , to be described , but the relationship of rustam with the ti-tles of the devil may be forgotten. what is certain is the name of Rustam in all Iranian resources, whether it is from ignorance or hostili-ty. However, if Rustam is not Iranian / Zoroastrian, then what religion and heroes his Iranianized qualities belong to?

Marquardt considers Rostam as the titles of Garshasb and even con-siders Rustam as the same Garshasb (Marquardt as quoted from Crit-ensen, the same: 195). Cristensen does not accept Marquardt 's view but he accepts Noldeka's ideas, and he believes that the story of Rustam is not related to Garshasb, but it is the folk myth of Sistan, Noldeka regards him not from Sakaidis

but from the old people of Sistan (Cristensen, the same: 197) which we can express the opposite views that the story of Rustam has been popular and known from the time of Gosanan and Parthian storytellers among Iranian people (Bahar, Bala-zade, 1386: 181). If the story of Rustam is related to the local culture of Ziranis - Sistan - how was it known during the Askanians in Iran? On the contrary, it is possible that it moved with the emigration of Iranians to central Asia and China where it was integrated with other indigenous folklore traditions (Bahar, the same). In confirming this, there is Rustam's name in the Sogdi text with a western Iranian phonological form and it is more similar to the middle Persian and Parthian than Sogdian (the same). Therefore, as opposed to Noldka's view, the narrative of Rustam cannot be related to the native culture of Sistan. Bahar knows the story of Rustam as related to Sakanids' myths inhabited in Sistan. But in the literature of the middle – times expressed in Khotani language, there is no mention of Rustam (Gharib, 1386: 173). The theory of Sakaid being of Rustam is not also correct. If there was a narrative among the Sakais, it might have been under the influence of their residence in the Medes which Herodotus has narrated. Some know the story of Rostam as related to the culture of the east of Iran, i.e. Soghdians according to the archaeological discovery in one of the caves of the 10th century Buddha in Dunhuang, China (Gharib, 1386: 171). The Sogdi manuscript speaks of Rostam's struggle with the Divs, but the discovered text is related to the beginning of the Achaemenid empire, the same era in which the Medes became good and evil and the Iranians as Ahura Mazda and goodness. Benonist rightly asks himself: "Does the existence of this story indicate the existence of Zoroastrian literature in Soghd?" Gershowich also sees this piece as Zoroastrian Soghdian. The existence of a very old minority of Zoroastrianism in Soghd in the late Achaemenid period is a certainty today (the same). The Sogdi version, therefore, is not the original version of Rustam but it is the construction of the Iranian design or façade that later Ferdowsi took it to a logical result and we will survey it below.

Rustam who has not been mentioned in any other sources is the artifact of Ferdowsi's mind that has molded the actions of other Iranian heroes on him and only his name is Rustam. "If Rustam found Ghobad, Giv would find Kaykhusraw in the battle with Toran under the creed of Godarz, Godarzians have a significant role, Godarz too would fight with Piran-e Waisa ... it is only in the last stage of the evolution of legendary history in the works of Sa'ali and Ferdowsi that Rustam took on a major responsibility... the narrations about the importance of Godarz and Godarzians is related to Sasanids era that is older than the narrations of heroes of Sistan .... Which penetrated in all wars..." (Cristensen, the same, 199-200). The story of finding KayGhobad by Rustam only has been said by Ferdowsi, it is looking like finding KayKhusraw by Giv ... So here, in imitation of Giv, an action is ascribed to Rustam" (the same, 202). The story of Rustam and Sohrab and ... is only in Shahnameh, it is not in Khodanama. Rustam's battle with the giant or Akvan Div has also come only in the Shahname. It is an imitation of the story of Goshtasib's struggle with the White Brotherhood. If we take all these out, there would be nothing left of Rustam except a vulgar tale (201 - 202). Therefore, as indicated by Marquart and Cristensen, Rustam is an imitation of Goshtasib or Giv and Godarz, and an independent identity has not been defined for it. His Seven Phase narrative is also the opposite of Hertsfield's which regards Seven Phases of Asfandiyar as an imitation of Seven Phases of Rustam (Hertsfield quoting from Noldka, 2537). Noldka and Cristensen correctly regards Seven Phases of Rustam as an imitation of Seven Phases of Asfandiyar (Cristensen, the same: 201; Noldka, the same: 94). The stories like the conquest of the fortress of Sepand, are an imitation of the story of Asfandiyar, and the passing of Seven

Phases and going to Alborz Mountain to bring KayGhobad are an imitation of bringing KayKhosraw by Giv from Turan (Cristensen quoting from Gharib, 1386: 173). "The story of Rostam and his power existed not among Arab writers nor KhodaNameh but it was a old separate narra-tive made from the traditions of Asfandiyar and ... (Noldeka, the same, 94). To capture the fortress of Sepand, Rostam hid his weapon in salt and conquered the fortress... Asfandiyar also utilized the same trick to conquer the fortress of Robin (Cristensen, 1343: 194).

Saalebi has regarded he seven phases of Rostam as belonging to the battle of Isfandiar with Arjasib and as an imitation of it (Safa, 1384: 533). Esfandiyar went to the back of the Roin fortress after Arjasib. The tale of the seven phases of Rostam is related to this journey. Isfandiyar in his seven phases fought with the wolf, the lion, the dragon, the sorcerer, and the phoenix. Rostam also fought with the li-on, the dragon, the sorcerer and ... (the ame: 597). Therefore, Rostam of Shahname did not exist in Iranian culture and his identity is the construction of Ferdowsi in imitation of other Iranian heroes. Thus, who was Rostam in origion?

"The characteristics of Iranian chivalry such as Rostam and ... are de-rived from the legend of Indera: Rostam and Indera, both would be born of their mothers' side ..." (Bahar, 1384: 28). The chivalries and the kings of Iran are the repetition of the old models ...but the study of Iran heroic history shows that there is no similarity between the he-roes and their behaviors and deeds in the historical era and the mythi-cal heroes and their deeds and behaviors and considering the moral aspects of Iranian heroes in the historical period, we should go after the other model since there is no sign of moral and mystical aspects in he deeds and behaviors of Indera" (the same: 29). Indera is one of the fiends of Wandidad which there the angel of Ordibehesht in contrast to it; thus, Indera is Median/Mithraist. Bahar has correctly stated that the origion of Rostam is derived from mythology of Indera and Mithra and ... but the changess and evolution has occurred in the characters and the mythical/ethical flavor has been molded on it. it means that only the name of Rostam Median/Mithraist and Ferdawsi has molded the Zorosatrian/mystical character on him to devoid Rostam out of his Mithraist meaning and against the Mede itself; the same action which the Mages and Daruis did with the Mehragan feast.

By the advent of Zoroastrianism, the mystical savours was given to the epic characters of Mithra and Indra. The pivot of Zoroastrian mystry is based on war events and it involves the worshipped Mithra, so it is not surprising that the pattern of virtue and piety existsin Iranian and Per-sian traditions ... Rostam is the Sakaid's hero of Shahnameh ...rising an earthly and epical hero up to the high spiritual status is a feature of the Iranian culture" (Rasil, kavyani, Dehbashi, 1388: 777). Shakid says that it is common in Iranian literature to give allegorical meanings to traditional contents ... the religious significance of Rostam grows in him later on" (Russell, Dehbashi, 1388: 778). Therefore, the original of Rostam has come from the Median myths of Mitra and Indra which Ferdawsi has taken it out from its tragic form and he has given it mys-tical/Iranian/Zoroastrian savior. " Rostam demanded every kind of abil-ity from the sun ... Rostam was known as a Zoroastrian mystic or gnostic" (the same, 780 ). The Dav and Demon becoming of the Medi-an deities, which were the old of Rostam's pattern, Ferddawsi made an Iranian/Zoroastrian Rostam through changing the true personality of Rostam. Ferdawsi has brought on Rostam the same calamity that the Mages set on Mithra himself and made the anti-solar Mithra as the so-lar Mithra -which we have already discussed.

By the Dav being of Mitra and Indera, the Zoroastrian/mystic Rustam was constructed, as the sun's Mehr was made. "Fodsirst, the Daeva (devil) were worshiped which they were deprived from being wor-shipped. The most important Dav, from among the collection of an-cient Median deities being removed, were Indera, Seora,... , the time of this event was the ends of the Medes and the beginning of Achamanid era"(Razi, 1385: 86). The Indera and Nawanga Daves are registered in the treaty of Mitani (the same: 104) or a female Dav un-der the name of ayehya, Fergard 21, article 17, which were Iyas in an-cient Indian meaning wild and disobedient wild meaning that it was the characteristics of Indera, too (Razi, the same: 106). Indera, as based on Bahar, is the pattern of Sam occupied by Iranian nation of Ferdawsî.

Rustam was from the Mede that they made it Iranian through changing his true personality. "In the late Sasanid and early Islam era, he was kown in western Iran or Kurdistana (Qadri) ... but there was no trace of him in the Zoroastrian literature and its center of power" (Bahar, 1384: 228). "When the religious center of Zoroastrianism was transferred from East and Balkh to Iran and Persia, the Pahlavi writings were re-peating the same epic materials ... there was no news of Rustam (the same: 228) , Rustam is a Kurdish hero (Bedlisi,). He was originally Kurd, but we knowhim from the filter of the Persian mind and we have forgotten his origins, as we have forgotten the origin of Mithra and the Kurd itself.

Ibn-e Balkhis Farsname reported, " Rustam the commandarof the leg-ends, has been a slave who was freed from servitude because of his services to the Great Shah,i.e KayKavos" (Ibn-e balkhi quoting from Widingern, 1390: 23). Compare this with the Medes when they changed into Kurds meaning the slaves; they became the Iranian arte-facts like Rustam, the heroes of this homeland, and the brave border sheltered people. As the Median anti-sun Mithra after becoming Irani-an turned into Ahura Mazda's slave and prayed to his shrine for ad-mission.

Robbing Rustam's identity in Iranian culture is the same as that of Mithra and Nowruz. nowruz under the original name of Mehregan festival was in spring and it was the celebration of the kurds victory; however, today the Kurds, unknowingly, celebrate the Nowruz with Iranian/Zoroastrian ritual traditions and constructs, unaware that they are Zahak themselves but they are proud of Kaveh and Feraydon.

The story of Rustam becoming Iranian is not unrelated to solar becom-ing of Mithra. Perhaps by changing the content of Mithra from the contract to the sun, Mithraism characters and symbols became so-lar/Iranian and solar. Rustam's Rakhsh (horse) is the nickname of the sun. Rakhsh turned the Median Rustam into Iranian. Rakhsh means brilliant (Bahar, 1386, 181). in shahnameh too, there are some similari-ties seen between Rustam and the sun which is one of the symbols of Apam Niat:

Rakhsh (the sun) made Rustam from the Mede (in both meaning of the Mede ethnic group and the physical and the earthly) as non - Median ( Iranian / mystic ), like the anti - Sun that they framed the title of the Sun on it. In some of the symbols discovered in the Mithraism caves, Mithra is depicted mounted on a cart pulled by a number of horses. One of the horses is trying to bring Mithra to the ocean, but the owner of the cart, the sun, which is accompanying Mithra, prevents moving of the rebellious horse, symbolizing Plato's bolting horse, towards the ocean, and he draws the lash of the horse towards the sun. This picture shows the end of the mission of Mithra and entrusting the mission of Mithra to the sun, that is the same solarizing/Iranianizing Mithra. In the story of Rustam, the same blight of solarizing Mithra

occurred to him. It is the horse that it shows the right direction to Rustam. Rakhsh saved the life of Rustam several times with its intelligence and the smell of his nose and its sharp eyesight; its eyesight is so sharp that he can see an ant in the black sea from two miles away, something that Rustam is not able to do (Bahar, the same:182). Rustam is merely physical power, he is like a blind camel that goes along the right path with the sharp eyes of the horse. Rustam is the same dark actions that Mazdak says he acts haphazardly not knowingly and based on the light of reason. It was the same ignorance of evil and the darkness of Mithra caves. Rakhsh used the bodily power of Rustam as a means to fight the Daves, Rustam's previous co-warriors. It is the same irrationality, which is practically an insurrection against Iran but it has an Iranian thought; today the Iranian Kurd is the construction of Iranian nation like Rustam in Shahname today. Rakhsh even tries to stop Rustam from returning to the Mithraism cave, the Shoghad well.

تن خویش را گرد کرده چو گوی همی رخس از آن خاک نو یافت بوی

زمین را به نعلش همیکرد چاک همی جست و ترسان شد از بوی خاک

چنین تابیامد میان دو چاه بزد گام رخس تکلور به راه

Therefore, Rakhsh is the symbol of the Sun, that is, the Iranian mentality which they constructed Iranian/mystic Rustam through metamorphosing Rustam's real character. But Rustam's destiny was to return to his origin, the darkness of the cave. But his deeds, under the guidance of the light of Rakhsh, have tarnished the identity of Rustam from his origins. Thus, the cave of Rustam- the Shoghad well- could not have been the cave of Mithra completely. The cave of Rustam - the Shoghad well - unlike the Mithraism caves being far from any beam of light was without the ceiling and it was under the sun radiation, and the rays of the sun, like poisoned arrows, were expunging Rustam's body. Both the Shoghad well and the sun radiation, the contrast of the dark beneath the earth with the sun of the sky, was the paradox of Rustam himself. The Median/Mithraist Rustam, who was Iranianized / mystified, remained neither Median/Mithraist nor completely became Zoroastrianism/Iranianized. The traces of him remaining in belief on Mithraism ritual in fighting the new hero of Zoroastrianism is quite evident. It was the same event for Rustam not becoming totally Zoroastrian/Iranian, which put pressure on his position in Persian culture and Shahname, and caused him to end in the bottom of the Shoghad well because the Iranian mystic culture had no place for the epical Mithraist/Median hero.

Ferdawsi, who brought Rustam into the Iranian culture by himself, said farewell unwillingly to all the nostalgies of his uninvited guest and put an end to the story of Rustam through a constructed story and with the emergence of mystic culture of rustam, which there remained no place for Rustam's epic. Even to put an end to Rustam, he concealed the main reason for the battle that was the contradiction between Rustam and Asfandiyar and he regarded Goshtasib as the cause of fighting by which he brought under question many of the principles of the Avesta - such as the purity of Goshtasib in Avesta, which is nothing more than the quest for power. "Although, there is no king more pious than Goshtasib in Shahname, he is the supporter of Zoroaster and first fighter of this Ahorai religion ... the praise or eulogy of Avesta towards him: glorious brave Goshtasib....I praise an Ahorai ..... with mace in the way of truth .... Is the column and protector of Ahorai Zoroaster" (Ferwardi Yasht, article 99 quoting from Maskob, 2536: 17). There is no one more vicious than this child-killer- Gishta-sib - he



is the king of egotism plot illegitimately sitting on the throne of the Ahoraian good faith owners (the same: 16). y entering the phoe-nix to the scene of the narrative, the natural course of the story changes and causes the story to go beyond surveying the level of the reliable semiology - semantics and approaches the level of discursive semiology – semantics (Behnam, No.4, 1390; 160). Entering the pheonix to the narrative, Ferdawsi continues to retain Rustam and his heroic acts so as not to harm the context of Shahnameh and trough making Rustam as the victor in the war with the culture and the religion of Iran -Asfandiyar, the narrator – Ferdawsi-removes the guilt of the abandon-ing and the loss of his uninvited guest (Rustam) out of his shoulder. Through constructing the story of Shoghad, he brought the story of Rustam to its end. To remove the guilt of destroying Rustam from his shoulders, he would throw this guilt on the shoulders of Rustam him-self by giving him an independent character from the narrator-Ferdawsi.

It is not only at the end of the story that phoenix saves Rustam from death but at the last moments of writing the story, it has penetrated into Ferdowsi's thought to preserve the hero of his dreams once again. When the tragic mentality of the master of speech has led, inevitably to say goodbye to two of his heroes, to the construction of their struggle, the tragic reality of the emergence of mystical religion of Zoroastrian-ism, which had began to end the era of the epic and Rustam (Iranian-ized), had forced Firdausi to end the story of Rostam. The age is the age of Zoroaster's religion and Asfanyar was the Iranian national hero and the hero of Zoroastrianism, has come to the battle with Rustam. Ferdawsi is also the hero of the speech of Iran and the religion of Zor-oaster escaping the paradox of his own mind rescue the hero of his sto-ry –Rustam- from annihilation for the last time. But with the advent of the religion of Zoroaster and the emergence of mysticism and spiritual-ity, there would remain no room for the tragedy of Mitra and Rustam. "In fact, the contrast between Rustam and Asfandiyar, the prince of the new religion, is a symbol of the conflict of new religion with the tradi-tions of chivalry, and that is what marks the decline of the age of chiv-alry. It is true that Rustam won the battle, but as if the last arrow has taken with his power of chivalry and he hath no doom but decay" (Moezin Jami, Dehbashi, 1388: 637). He has to say farewell to his hero by constructing the story of the brother Shoghad. Perhaps if Ferdowsi had the tactics of the Mages who could construct Mithra as Irani-an/Zoroastrian well, he would make him Zoroastrian/Iranian instead of ending the story of Rustam. But Rustam's rejection to the religion of Zoroaster, which has come in Shahnam in the form of refusing to ac-cept the chain and handcuff of Asfandiyar, left no room for making Rustam as Zoroastrian. The real hero of Ferdawsi isnnot Rustam but Asfanyar. Rostam is victorious over Esfandiar through trickery, which is not the fashion of epic heroes in Shahnameh. in contrast to Maskob's words in which phoenix is "the symbol of god 's charisma separated from Asfandiyar and has joined with Rostam (Maskob, 2536: 64), it is not the divine charisma but it is against it. The phoenix is the symbol of darkness and demon whose devil wings comes beautiful to Asfandiyar's eyes.

Bahar writes: "Perhaps the deterioration of Rustam was because he did not conform to the ancient Mehri model" (Bahar, 1384: 39). In contrast to Bahar's words it exactly meant that he declined because he was ac-cording to the Mithraism model and he did not accept the pattern of Zoroaster. Since Asfandiyar had no place in the religious narrations of Zoroaster, he had to be destroyed. Asfandiyar, who was the same Da-ruis, was eliminated from the dynasty of the

Holy kings of Kiyani be-cause of his revolt against Goshtasib and Zoroaster and their elimination and also calling himself as the representative of AhoorMazd. There is no mention of him after goshtasib. In the old version Yadgar-e Zariran, the main heroes are Bestor, Goshtasib and Zarir. Ferdawsi made Asfandiyar as the main hero of Zariran and Zoroastrianism and since

Asfandiyar had no place in the continuation of the story and the religious narrative of Zoroastrianism, Asfandiyar had to end his story, too. Thus, he constructed the struggle of Asfandiyar with Rustam; in so doing, he did not pay attention to Avesta, and he represented the main hero of Avesta as a bad nature person to take the sin for the struggle of two heroes and two religion away from each of them and to represent a third person as the agent of their struggle.

However, with all the changes he did to Rustam's personality and making him Iranian, Ferdawsi has not fully been able to do it and there remains a core of the true Rustam in Shahname. Even among the words of the master of speech, his hostility is visible well to the divine Farah of Persian kings and Zoroaster. The war of Rustam and Asfandiyar was a religious one ... the epic and mythology are the reports of the sacred, spiritual, and religious beliefs. Dinawari writes: as Rustam received the news of Goshtasib becoming Majosi (Zoroasterian), he became angry hard and he said that he put aside the ritual of our fathers and joined the new religion ... . With the gathering of the people in Sistan, the removal of Goshtasib and their opposition to Goshtasib became evident ... Goshtasib sent Asfandiyar to fight with Rustam with the promise of becoming king not possible except by the killing of Rustam (Moazin-e Jami, Dehbashi, 1388: 635). Dinawari attributed the revolt of Rustam to Goshtasib to the change of his -Goshtasib - religion (Dinawari, quoting from Noldeka, 2537: 179). Maraquradt also considers the accusation of atheism as the genesis of the religious war between Rustam and Asfandiyar (the same: 195). Spiegel regards Asfandiyar as the religious hero of the Zoroastrian priests and he considers Rustam as the ascendants of Zahak (Spiegel quoting Noldeka, the same: 114). Rustam's power originates also from his mother's race -his satanic race-, i.e. Zahak (the same: 30). Asfandiyar also reminds him of his evil race in his declamations to defy Rustam (Farwahar, No.4, 1389: 21).

The banner of Rustam is also the body of the Dragon (Bahar, the same: 233), the phoenix which assisted Rustam in battle with Asfandiyar is from the devil world (the same: 29). Asfandiyar killed the phoenix in the fifth phase (Safa, 1384: 597) that " with respect to the position of the phoenix in Mehrian religion, it is the result of the domination of the good religion on the old ritual and also the contradiction with Rustam ..." (Moezin-e Jami, the same: 634). Thus, Rustam was a true Mithraist, which had been trying to depose Goshtasib because of his conversion to Zarathustra (Cristensen, quoting from Jami, the same: 635). Like an atheist, Rustam opposed the diffusion of a new religion (Dinawari, quoting from Noldeka, the same: 114). The young age of Esfandiyar and the old age of Rostam are the irony of the novelty of Zoroastrianism and the ancient being of Mehr/Mithra (Moazin Jami, Dehbashi, 1388: 637). The unknown author of Sistan history wrote: "The battle between Rustam and Asfandiyar was because of the advent of Zoroastrianism that Rustam denied it and refused to obey Goshtasib and accompany the throne ... in which Goshtasib knew by Jamasib's anticipation that Asfandiyar's death would be at the hands of Rustam ... He sent him to be killed ... " (Moezine Jami, the same: 634). Therefore, the Kianian war with the clan of Rustam was a holy war (Cristensen, 1343: 80). Asfandiyar is the supreme religious hero of Mazdayasna and Rustam,

who did not become Zoroastrian, had the same reverence as a Torani (Bahar, 1384; 249). This holy war could not be anything except the war of Darius with Gaumates and ... Thus, unlike Bahar's view, the deterioration of Rustam in Iranian culture was not in conformity with the ancient Mehrism paradigm, but it was due to the pre-senace of Mehrism pattern in his personality that was incompatible with the Iranian / Zoroastrianism culture.

Shahrozi has hinted at the departure of Zoroaster to Rustam and his invitation to his religion and Rustam's denial. "Zoroaster became sad when he presented the religion to Rustam and he refused it. Later, when Wishtasib, the king accepted the religion and the ritual was developed, Asfandiyar went to Rustam to invite him to the new religion. Rustam refused to accept the old religion again, and persisted in maintaining the old faith. The cause behind Rustam and Asfandiyar battle is the same thing - the religious struggle - which led to the killing of Asfandiyar, the religion's famous commander so the name of Rustam is removed from Avesta and Yashts. As due to some considerations, Ferdawsi did not express reason for the battle of Rustam and Asfandiyar with the possibility of knowing it" (Razi, 1380: 33). Rustam is the same Mithra, and Goshtasib and Asfandiyar, the religious heroes of Zoroaster, are the same Dariush and Cyrus, and the religious battle of Rustam and Asfandiyar is the religious struggle of Zoroaster with the ritual of Mithra crystallized in the military form of the Iranians wars with the Medes.

Though the shahnameh does not explicitly mention this point - the religious war – and it has hidden knowingly or unknowingly the cause of the war (Razi, 1380: 438), but it is not free from some hints ...so that when Peshotan advises Asfandiyar to withdraw his hand from Rustam, Asfandiyar from the religious position says:

کسی چشم دین را به سوزن ندوخت دوگیتی به رستم نخواهم فروخت

Or when Asfandiyar sent Bahman to Rustam with ten priests. Also, when Asfandiyar was dying with Rustam's arrow, Peshotan called him affectionately he swordsman of the religion:

به مردی بر آهیخت شمشیر کین چو اسفندیاری که از بهر دین

Rustam, too, stresses his religious dispute with Asfandiyar by calling him a newcomer in the religion. For, if they had the same religion, she had no reason to call him so:

...بدو گفت رستمکهای پهلوان نوآیین ونوشاخو فرخ جوان

At last, Asfandiyar recounts his religious works one by one to Rustam, and says that the regions of the earth are now under the control ring of the good religion:

ز گردنکشان سر بر آوردهام شنو کارهایی که من کردهام تهی

کردم از بت پرستان زمین نخستین کمر بستم از بهر دین

...که با مجمر آورده بود از بهشت برافروختم آتش زردهشت

Goshtasib himself had already traveled to Sistan before sending Asfandiyar to Rustam and Shahnameh has emphasized on the preaching intention of Goshtasib for the religion:

که خسرو سوي سيستان کرد روی برآمد بسی روزگاران بر اوی

...کند و بدان را بر آن گوا که آنجا کند زند و استاروا

This part is from Daghighi in Shahnameh, there is hiatus in the story of Goshtasib and Asfandiyar. Because half of it has been recited by Daghighi and another half by Ferdawsi. "Perhaps if the story of Rustam and Asfandiyar had been recited by Daghighi, he would have shown its religious aspects more clearly... the violence of Goshtasib with Rustam was due to the lack of success in his propagandistic travel ..." (the same: 637). Asfandiyar is the true hero of the religion of Zoroaster (Yasht 13/103, quoting from Zarinkoob, 1368: 53). However, Rustam like Arjasp refuses to accept the new religion. Defeating Asfandiyar by Rustam and Rustam's resistance up to the end in not admitting Asfandiyar's chains and fetters might be a sigh of Daruis' harsh and violent treatment with the Mithraists in which -as according to Hints- he ruined all the traces of Mithraism and he showed much more violence in treating Mithraists like Gaumates, Ferawartish and Chicertokhma than with the other rebels.

...به مردی مکن باد را در قفس مگوی هر آن چه نگفته است کس  
 ...نه بگرفت شیر زیان جای من ندیده است کس بند بر پای من  
 شکستی بود زشت کاری بود مگر بند کز بند عاری بود  
 که روشن روانم برین است و بس نبیند زنده مرا با بند کس  
 ...از آن به که نامم برآید به ننگ مرا سر نهان گر شود زیر سنگ

The fact that Esfandiyar, even after the defeat of Rostam, sent his son, Bahman to Rustam to educate him with ten priests is an irony of changing pattern of Zoroastrian Iranians in dealing with the Medes and Mithra. In which, even in contrast to the killing pattern of Cyrus and Darius, violence and destruction are not the remedy to solve the Medes/Kurds issue but they must be killed by the cushion. They destroyed Mithraism from inside by sending the priests alongside with Bahman to the Mithra land of Rustam and by Zoroastrianizing it.

"Training Bahman by Rustam is meaningful. The new religion must acquire the secrets of life and death of the ancient ritual to be able to break the ancient ritual" (the same: 637). Bahman is a symbol of Wa-homneh, the good thought of Zoroastrianism, that – as based on Cris-tensen takes the place of Mithra in the religion of Zoroaster. With the defeat of brutal treatment of Asfandiyar / Dariush with, ah the religion of Mithra, Bahman, who is the same Ardashir, vacated it from the inside by the apparent acceptance of Mitra. The disappearance of Mithra was not the action of the sword of Esfandiyar / Darius, but it was the work of priests along with Bahman, which through making Mithra as Iranian /Zoroastrian, deformed the original Mithra and propounded I. the Iranian/Zoroastrian Mithra. The death of Esfandiyar in this struggle is not a real death, but a symbolic death. The life and the triumph of Rustam is symbolic, too. Asfandiyar was expected to win the war, but he was defeated with the resistance of simorgh/pheonex, the evil / Mithraist bird; he defeated Rustam, but the culture of the struggle of Mithra, simorgh/pheonex, was invincible. Darius destroyed thousands of the Medes, but the culture of the Medes/Kurds' resistance was never lost. For this reason, he turned to "care" instead of "punishment" and instead of the sword, he sent priests along with Bahman to the homeland of Rustam, who destroyed it from inside with the apparent acceptance of the that ritual and through Zoroastrianizing it. Rustam resisted the sword of ironed- body Asfandiyar, but he was eventually defeated in against to a small child Bahman alongside the thoughts of the priests. In

the narrative of Masodi in *Morawij-o Zahab*, Rustam is destroyed not by his brother but by Bahman's campaign in Sistan. Bahman is the same light, or great light, a unified light issued from the source of all the lights (Razi, 1380: 263), and Rustam is a symbol of the actions of the evil. Is he the sign of solarizing anti-Mithra sun? Maybe Bahman is Ardashir that is present even in the depictions of the Mithra along with Ahura himself after cursing Mithra by Zoroaster/Daruis. Of course, he is no longer Mithra, he is the other sun or Zoroastrian Mithra.

Rustam of Ferdawsi, who has fought in the defence of Iran and the kings of Kiyani, was not the real Rustam but he was constructed under the influence of Ferdawsi's Iranian/Zoroastrian Rustam, as the anthology writers, influenced by the "Islamic ideas" such as *Jahangir Nama*, constructed a kind of Rostam who fights idols, Lat and Aza" (Safa, 1384: 372).

Rustam's death is also symbolic. The spears planted in the well could be the irony for the sun's rays, each of which is a shot (Jami, the same: 639). But unlike Jami's view, this does not mean the sunset of the Mehr-worshippers, because Mehr-worshippers did not worship the sun. It is true that the beams of the sunlight were deadly for Rustam meaning Rustam did not yield before the sharp sword of iron-body Asfandiyar, but he was destroyed by the sun-worshipper becoming of Mithra, i.e. being transformed from interior. The Rustam well can be a symbol of the Mithraists' cave and also Afrasiab and Zahak's under-ground castle which was far from the sun. But this well, unlike the cave, was exposed to the sunlight. The sun was the end of the black night and the darkness of the Mithra cave. The illusion of the sun is the end of the dark tragedy of the Mithraists world. The poisoned arrows inside the well are a symbol of the light of the sun that takes the last breaths out of Rostam/Mithra. They are the symbol of changing the nature of Mithra from the contract to the sun in Iranian culture that Iranian / solar becoming of Mithra was his deformation and destruction.

The light of the sun which is healing and holy for Zoroastrians is getting worse than poisoned spear for Rostam. It prevents him from being calm in the darkness of the cave. However, it is not only Rustam who became the Iranian, the other Median gods would become Iranian / Zoroastrian, which they are symbolically represented in the form of Arjasib girls. In spite of the *Shahnameh* that have considered the girls to be Goshtasib's been stolen by Arjasib, Yasht 9 correctly knows the girls - Hotosa and Homaya - as Arjasib's girls, whom Goshtasib expropriated. Hotosa is the same Nahid and Homaya as the same Hom. Goshtasib's marriage with them is actually their seizure by the Iranians. In Yasht 5, the name of Goshtasib's father "Aoratasib" has been utilized as the feature of the sun and the goddess "Aya Nit" (Cristensen, Dehbashi, the same: 662) Cristensen considers Aorotasp as the real father of Wishtasib (the same). But Aorotasp has a symbolic meaning here, and as Cristensen pointed out, it is the trait of the sun and it connotes Wishtasib's spiritual father and his sun-worshipping action. The connotation of Wishtasib marrying Arjasib's girls is that the Iranians confiscated Heotosa, Nahid, and Homaya – the plant of Hom – that were among the Median goddesses and made them Zoroastrian. Through solarizing the anti-sun goddess, they made them Iranian, as they made Rustam Iranian.

Rustam's death at the hands of his brother "Shoghad" is also an allusion to the destruction of the ritual from inside itself (Moezi Jami, the same, 638). Rustam, who did not yield to any of the cutting blades and royal power, would be removed through occupying his thought by

Zoroastrianism priests, or by the members of his family becoming – Shoghad – Zoroastrian/iranian.

Asfandiyar's eyes that were closed in the water while sanctifying Zoroaster for making him brazen-bodied, was not due to his eyes not touching with the invulnerable water; therefore, they plunged into the darkness in contact with the evil/Mithraist feathers of the phoenix. Mithra

is the symbol of the darkness - refer to the chapter about Mithra-, Asfandiyar would lose his eyesights in the first contact with the feathers of the phoenix. Phoenix takes away the light of the eyes of good religion Asfandiyar, as Zahak drains (washes) the brains of the Zoroastrian youths.

The blindness of Asfandiyar by the phoenix is anti-Plato/ Zoroastrianism. Plato sees the instantaneous transition from the darkness to light as the cause of the blindness; however, Asfandiyar, who has come from the world of the light and he abruptly attempted to enter the dark cave and the evil world of phoenix, could not bear the truth of the darkness of the world and he instantly became blind in touch with the darkness.

It is not only Mithra and Rustam, but the whole epic history and heroes of Shahname, dating back to the advent of the Zoroaster religion, which declined with the advent of Zoroaster. The Median Iranianized Rustam is a full symbol of Iranianized Median Shahnameh. The Iranian culture begins to evolve with the religion of Zoroaster in its reality. That is, whatsoever existed before Zoroaster has not belonged to the Iranian culture. Yasts, which involve the heroes and epic soul, constituted Yasna and prayers with the advent of Zoroaster. The emergence of Greater Iran culture is the decline of tragic and epic culture. The origin of the epic culture - as Bahar has indirectly pointed out - belongs to the ancient form of Mithra and Indra nicknamed as the Daves and Devil in the Zoroastrian religious culture. "With the end of the story of Rustam and Asfandiyar, a great rupture would take place in the national narrative of Iran - the Kianians and the knights would emerge from the stage ... After that, there would be confusion and vagueness in the existence of several Shahs to Alexander and afterwards to the Sassanid dynasty and ..." (Moezin Jami, the same: 640-641). Therefore, the origin of the epic culture and the practical struggle of knights was related to the Mithraist culture of the Medes, that the Magas and those like Ferdawsi made Iranian through extracting it out of its Median origins and giving it the Iranian/Zoroastrian appearance. In the vacuum of the epic culture in the history of Iran, the Ashkanids princes, after occupying the Medes and becoming familiar with Yashts, entered their own names like Giv, Kave and ... in the epic culture of the Medes, gave it a Zoroastrian/mystic form and they distorted its origins. Noldeke and Marquardt have proven that "some of the heroes of the Iranian national stories are the historical people of the Ashkanids era ... the influx of the ashkanids in the Kianian histories ... in the Sassanian era, the names of Ashkanids kings has entered in the number of knights of Kianiann era" (Cristensen, 1343: 185). In the struggle against the Medes resistance, the Iranian mystical / spiritual culture robbed their tragic culture (the Medes) out in the absence of the Medes' defence and campaign culture and they restored or revive it with a mystic / Iranian glaze. Therefore, Shahnameh is the history of Aniran with Iranian appearance that we see in Shahname. After the advent of Zoroaster and the death of epic and Rustam, this culture turned from a very rich and wonderful poetry to a dry and meaningless poems and Ferdawsi had to consign his mission sooner or later to Maolanan and Sohrwardi. Most of the Shahnameh was derived from oral traditions of the Medes and texts such as Mithraic Yashts but they gave it a Zoroastrian/Persian seal and color. The Persians were immigrants were like philistine Mogols and Turks, who not only defeated the Medes militarily and politically and called the conquered territory of the Medes as Iran, but

also they confiscated the whole Median cul-ture and concepts and changed their meanings. They devoiced Mithra, Rustam, Ferawashi, FarahIzadi and even the Median language from their Mithraist meaning and gave it a metaphysical/Persian meaning. Iranian being of zarathustra does not mean what has been known as Zoroastrian ito see as Iranian, since zarathustra emerged from the Mede and he seized the Median/Mithraist concepts and words and he gave it the persian / metaphysical meaning. In avesta, for example, the words like “khasotera”, “Zamatr” has been used that even today the kurds utilizethem and they call the groom’s father as “ khasora”, but these words does not exist among the Persians. For this reseason, Darmester considers the Avestan language as the Median and today’s Kurdish language as the remaining traces of it. In fact, Iranian riation is a break in the continuation of the Median identity.

Iranian culture is a mystic culture. The culture of mysticism is yielding, which is why, in the face of all Turks, Aghoz, Mogols and Arabs, the Persians yielded to the cultures of the invaders. Kurdish culture is the culture of the tragedy rather than surrender. Instead of beig lost in general aspects, it forms them itself. Kurds preferred the freedom among the mountains to living in the civilisa-tions. Throughout the history of the Assyrian rule up to the contempo-rary period, the Kurds/Medes have not gone under the domination and they have still preservedtheir epic culture, and their struggle oly with the difference that they have not written about it. As the tragic culture- as Kafman says –is action oriented, it is silent showing its nature with action rather than words. Tthe culture of Iran from the beginning to the end is a mystical and Mavlanai culture. Even the Iranianized Rustam has little difference to Mawlana. The seven phases of Asfandiyar and Rustam is an ascent to spiritual and mystical world. "There are some barriers in the way of the struggle, like the dragon and the lion, and ... that are the symbols of the land and the human reason and they must be crossed through their barriers to climb into the divine universe. The seven phases of Asfandiyar has a mystical concept that is influenced by Gnostic literature, the passing of the gnostic man from the seven phas-es and ...” (Bahar, 1384: 451). The passage from epic to mystic, inspite of Henrry Kerbin’s view, has been formulated not with Sohrawardi but with the Mages and ferdawsi. All parables, in the wisdom, mysticism I general and mysticism of Islam, are based on the opinions expressed by the ancient Iranian sages and they have their own roots in Avesta and Pahlavi sources (Razi, 1380: 516). Sohrawardi is not the break from Ferdowsi but the logical result of the master of speech in Shahnameh. The phoenix which in Rustam story is a symbol of the darkness of the evil and darkens the world for Asfandiyar’s eyes with its feathers chages into a symbol of the sun through the distortion of the Iranian mystical culture reaching the climax in Sohrawardi (Taheri, 1383 / 3: 23). Pheonix, which is a devil bird (Noldeka, 2536: 29), is one of devil barriers in front of good faith Asfandiyar in phase fifth. His contribu-tion to the birth of Rustam is a symbol of the evil/Mithraist and the Medes culture becoming the sun and a sacred and mystical bird through the filter of Irrannian filter. It was in the same way that the anti - sun Mithra turns into the sun and a symbol of the sun and as the anti-Iranian Kurd changes into the original Iranian. Sohrawardi targeted another side of the Iranian epic myth which its themes or motifs exist-ed in Avistan –Pahlavi sources and reflected in Shahname, too (Razi, 1380: 20). Whatsoever Shahabadin-e Sohrawardi has expressed in Hekmat-ol Ashraq, which are the foundations of his philosophy are the same things and issues stated in Avistan-Pahlawi resources (the same, 261). The total seven phases of Zoroaster and Islamic mysticism are derived from the seven phases of Mithra. However, there is a little dif-ference between them so that the seven phases of Mithra

is a rise to the world of Hadis to clean the body from the dirt of the heaven and spirituality while the seven phases of Zoroastrianism mystic is to climb to the supreme universe and the removal of pollutions of the land and body pollution from the soul and spirituality. In fact, they have taken the Median Mithraist concepts and symbols but they have turned their meanings and purposes upside down. The seven phases of Mithra is a passing from non-Godess and towards caring for man and reason and will; the last stage of the seven phases of Mithraism is is a sage who stands for contract and the requisite to contract and equality is the ab-sence of any rules and the metaphysical and pre - human laws. Pheonix and lion are the important stages of Mithraist seven stages while they should be killed in the upside down Islamic / Iranian seven stages.

Sohrawardi revived the religious factors of the ancient Iran, he revived the world-lights of ancient Iran in reference to Hermes and Hermesi tradition (Karbon, 1384: 75). The way and the methods of Sohrawardi is the method of philosophical wisdom of Hermes: "My path and methodology are the ways of Plato and the father of the wiseman, Hermes and ...the Fars saint, Jamasif Bozar Jomhor" (Sohrawardi, quoting from Poornamdaryan, 1390: 14). He also writes: "The wisdom of Hermes who is the father of the wiseman traces back in Greece to Plato, in Persia to Kayoumars, Firidon and Kaykhosraw and in Islam to Bastami and ... (the same: 16). Sohrawardi completed the mystic-making of the epic which had began with the Mages and Firdausi. Therefore, the mystic (Irfan) of Soherwordi is not at the break - up from the rationality of Avicenna and the epic of Ferdawsi but it is their logical results. Henry Kerbon indicates correctly that Sohrawardi is the continuation of Avicenna: "it can certainly be said that Sohrawardi is the successor of Ibna Sina... he completed the plan of Ibn Sina's philosophy that he failed to achieve due to the lack of good resources in his disposal, and he enacted it with a revival of philosophy and devine wisdom of the ancient Iran which was thr wisdom of the light" (Kerbin, quoting from Poornamdaryan, 1390: 13). The process which continued in Iran and Mithra - Ahura - especially Mithra, turned into symbolic, ethical and mystical myths and Mehri's path (Tarighat) went through Khosrawani's wisdom (Razi, 1381: 178) in which the anti-sun Mithra eventually turned into the sun itself in Sohrawardi (Taheri, 1383/3: 23). the legendry phoenix acquires the manifestation of Roh-Al Ghodos (Kerbin, 1384: 121). This change and transformation was the result of the distortion of the Mages in Yashts, "The materials of the new Yasht are about prayer and invocation merly having ethical and worshiping aspects that are different from the methods and con-cepts of the old Yasnas and Wisperds... .

But the issues presented in the Old Yashts are dynamic, martial, hero-ism, epical, war and struggle, and th active, lively and energytic lives of the people" (Razi, 138: 325). The mystical making of the Median epics started with distorting the Yashts by the Mages completed with Shahname and achieved its ends with Sohrawardi. Sohrawardi com-pleted the transition from the epic and history to mysticism that the transition from tragedy to mysticism. Iranism and Hermitism are both visible in the works of Shrawardi (Carbon, the same: 122). Basically, Iranism has begun with Zoroaster Hermatism; Zoroastrianism is, as Molle says, a mystical ritual.

The foundations of Hermatism/Iranism developed in contrast to Hero-ism/Medism. It is worth noting that Iranian/mestic becoming of the Kurdish epic achieved its final forms by Sohrawardi who is apparently a Kurd himself indicating the digestion of the Kurdish/tragic culture in



Iranian/mystic culture. A complete example of this culture is seen in the spread of mysticism and Sofism in Kurdistan in case it had not had a Mithrasim base, it would not have spreaded so much. In the same manner, if Sheism had not had so much similarity to Zoroastrianism mystic, it would not have extended in Iran; thus, this does not mean that mysticism is a the continuation from Mehrism ritual but it is the break in the continuation of Mehrism. Sima'e and Zikr in mysticism are the same Kurdish dance, i.e Halparke, but it has acquired the meaning of Iranian mysticism. For instance, the the cow-killing ceremony of Pir-e Shalyar in Hawraman is symbolically Mithraist, but it has taken Islam-ic / mystical meaning. Mystical seven labours are the same reversed seven phases in Mithraism; the transition occurs towards the earth in Mithraism but the transition happens to heaven in mysticism. The snake of Mithra has remained symbolically in mysticism among Darawishes, many of them always carry a snake with them. Many of the darwishes. The darwishes temples were dark like Mithraism caves so as to dance in mystical way or the same Simae and the Darwishes used the Mithra-ism word and concept "Pir" for thier Shaekhes or leaders and still the ceremony of the bull sacrifice of the bull and the dance has remained among the Dervishes, but its subjectivity and mentality is no longer Mithraist.

The internal changes of the Mede/Mithra from anti-Iran/Zoroaster to Iranian/Zoroasterian initiated with Bahman and the priests after the the stablishment of Daruis ruling, it reached its peaks with KhodayName and Shahname and it arrived at its final destination with Hekmat-e Ashragh, that is, its complete digestion and assimilation in Irani-an/mystical culture.

Asfandiyar: the Truth or the Power:

The truth thought in the heart of Asfandiyar would be repeatedly sup-pressed by the love of getting to the throne (Maskob, 2536: 46). Asfandiyar considered himself the most eligible person to get to the kingdom and he did not even take his father into account; his goal was to gain power by any means. If there was no confrontation with Rusta , he would take him off the throne by a coup and a revolt against his father (Farwaha, 4, 1389: 24). Even Shahnameh showing Asfandiyar so holy and as the supporter of the religion has not been able to conceal Asfandiyar's quest for power and gaining it in return of losing any sorts of ethical values, customs and family. Asfandiyar would not hear her mother's advice and would not take into account Rustam's braveries on the path of Greater Iran. To reach the kingdom, he would ignore all the principles and does not subdue to Rustam's wishes, and he must convince Rustam of his power and views. On the other hand, Asfandiyar is the main hero of the religion of Zoroaster and (National) hero of Iran. He considers the way to realize Iranism and Zoroaster's approach as to achieve the absolute power. The power for Asfandiyar might be the instrument of the truth of religion and the nation at the beginnng.

دلش تاب گیرد شود بت پرست که هر کس که آرد بدین دین شکست

نباشد از کسی مرا ترس و بیم میانش به خنجر کنم بر دو نیم

Asfandiyar wants the dagger and power to cut the enemies of the religion of Zoroaster into two halves, but he is so tempting to gain power that the power itself becomes the aim, the religion, and its ideals. Asfandiyar is a symbol of the political wisdom of Iranism, which tries to achieve the power and the absolute kingdom under the name of the Truth, the removal of Lies, the arrival of the angel, and the annihilation of Dava. However, ultimately the power becomes the target and the truth as its tool. The policy that wanted to be a tool of reason turned into its purpose. The intellect which was the ideal of power became its instrument. What is basic is politics and power, and the wisdom and religion are their instruments. The main sin of the Rustam was not in Zoroaster religion, but in not yielding to the absolute power of the Goshtasib whose religion was Zoroastrianism. Goshtasib was not only worried about Rustam's personal conviction, but his concern was for what he knew as the truth the other was indifferent to it. The battle of Asfandiyar was also in the same manner. Rustam would admit that he would gladly go with Asfandiyar, but with the pride of power would incite Asfandiyar to take Rustam with his hands tied to show off his royal power to a serf. Belief in the Zoroaster religion and preaching it was due to this fact that Zoroastrianism would permit Asfandiyar to fulfil personal wishes, his quest for power and the possibility of the power monopoly. All these hostilities with Mitra were due to the Mitra's asymmetry with the absolute power of the state, which Asfandiyar / Darius tried to destroy. The Persian political power has always chosen some religions and ideologies to give legitimacy to itself according to the authority and the monopoly of power in the ruling class taken from Zoroastrianism to Zil-o asoltan (the shade of the ruler), from the monarchy to Wali-e Faghi and unificational nationalism. "The sassanians leading from the political centralism to the religious centralism was because it did not bring the demands of this government and so ... and it turned into a hostile religion and was broken down" (gergorich, Reza, 1365; 121). Mazdak promoted for a while because of the demands of Qad the first to squash the intruders of his power for a while, but he was eventually defeated for the lack of ideological and governmental character ... in a coup of his opponents (GUILLEMIN, 17). Iranian political ration would prefer the preservation of power on other nations over anything else, and religion and truth has just been to acquire and keep the power. Politics has always preceded the culture and absolute power has absolutely existed in kings. This is the same method in this book that Iranian wisdom from myth and religion to science and ideology, from Ahura – to Iran has always been a tool in the service of the domination of the Persian ethnicity and the truth of the Iranian claims has served the political power well. Therefore, the Greater Iran has no cultural and identity basis and its continuity depends on political power and ideology of ruling authority and its culture has exactly been the same as its politics.

## Chapter 5:

## The development of the Political ration of iran in Contrast to the Kurd Identity

(Anoshirwan and Mazdak)

The mazdak uprising – as Ilthaim and Wishofer say – was in the con-tinuation or the reproduction of the Gaumates uprising and – as Cris-tensen and Klima say- it was the Avanguard of Islamic era movement of Kramdinan. This movement began in the early years of Ghobad rul-ing in 494 AC and continued until 524. Due to the support of mazdak movement, Ghobad was ousted from the monarchy, and after return-ing to the throne with the help of Hiatla, he left out his support of Mazdakis and finally when Anowshirvan sat on the throne of the mon-archy, Mazdakids were masacared.

In 484 , Persia suffered a serious defeat in the war with Hiatla and paid a huge tribute. Balash wanted to take heavier taxes from the the great land owners to help fill the empty treasury, but htese measures led to the fact that the nobles led by Sokhra from Karin’s family brought him out of the throne and made him blinds. Ghobad ascended the throne after Balash (484- 488) at the age 16 and Sokhra became his vice - regent. In 496, the age of 24, he realised that the issues were out of his hands and Sokhra had become kingmaker and allroun peson of the realm, he killed Sokhra with the help of Shapoor and took control of the kingdom. To catch the power monopoly in his hand, he used the Mazdakids movement to break the power of the nobles. In 496, a year after the start of the revolt, he ousted Kubat out of the monarchy and replaced him with his brother Jamasib. The elders and priests, with the help of ZarMehr, Sokhra’s son, rose against him because of his support of the Mazda’s revolt. Ghobad was jailed in Faramoshi castle - farash-bord in Khositan so as to esacape from the jail with the help Siawash - from elders - and his sister - or – his wife - and went to Hayatla territo-ry in northeastern Iran. With the help of Hiatla, Kubat returned to the throne and dismissed Jamasib from the throne. After returning to the throne, Kubat left his support of Mazdakids and willingly or unwilling-ly consigned the throne to his son KayKhosraw (Anoshirwan) and gavehim the green light to massacre the Mazdakids. Anoshirwan again reproduced and rearranged the disordered structure of the Sasanids which was set on the verge of collapse by Mazdakids’ movement

This is a summary of the developments that have preoccupied the mind of many analysts for its analysis. Was the uprising of Mazdak social / political or religious, or both? Was Ghobad's support for Mazdakids due to his humanitarian manner or his belief in him or a policy to establish his power in the direction of struggling with the aristocrats? and many other arguments that continue to be discussed. Before any analysis, we will survey the resources on the information on Mazdakids to clarify the perspectives of the writers of the Mazdak history for us.

#### Surveying the resources on Mazdak and developing Iranian historiography

Before anything, it should be noted that there has existed no such thing as historical knowledge in ancient Iran and writing independent history of the king's wills. The kings were also using the historiography as the instrument in the service of their political ideology and the preservation of their imperial power. In his writings, Darius introduces his interpretation of the events related to the Gaumates uprising as immortal facts, which no one must question their correction. "Darius king says: you will not destroy this inscription that I wrote and pictures you see and even keep them (DB, 4, 67-69). If you see these inscriptions and pictures and do not destroy, if you would preserve them, Ahormazd would be your supporter ... he would bless your end ... if you see these inscriptions and images and destroy them and could not preserve them, Ahormazd will harm you and destroy your family....(DB,4,72-80)".

Therefore, the historical knowledge of ancient Iran, which is the source of Islamic era and even contemporary historians, has been written in terms of love and hatred of kings and conquerors of history and it can not reflect the facts correctly. In other words, Iranian text / knowledge has always been a source of ethnic dominance of the Persians. That is why the written history is different from the real history – as Will Durant says. The relationship of text to the social and political context of text production must be taken into consideration. The political texture leading to the production of text in the form of ill-tempered Ishmogh and ... about Mazdak was basically formed in against Mazdak's movement and his goals. Therefore, the fundamental purpose of this structure, which has monopolized the production of text in the case of Mazdak, has been to destroy and defame the movement of Mazdak and his aims. In other words, the relation of the produced reason with politics and hegemony has to be measured so that produced knowledge has nothing more than the tool of domination and power but in fact its justification. Therefore, in order to write a more reasonable history independent of the presented viewpoints of the rulers, we must study the produced texts of the Persian victors or conquerors from one hand with the method of discourse analysis. On the other hand, in the absence of texts from convicts like Mazdak, we must interpret the social behaviors of the revolutionary movements such as Mazdak based on hermeneutics. Although in the absence of adequate resources, an objective analysis cannot be presented, but in any case it would be better than writings of the enemies of these movements (the kings).

Because of the lack of historiography in Iran, "the king himself composed the history and he decided what to record for the future" (Klima, 1371: 47), historical knowledge narrated in the shape of the myth was not the reflection of reality and the production of knowledge, but it was the production of power from the direction of knowledge and truth. There developed a kind of "religious patriotism" in this history, taken from Kayumart to Sasanian that everything was in the service of religion, determination and religious propaganda (the same, 50). The religion

was also the egemonic tool of the state / Persian Empire and the government has been the instrument of the ethnic domination of the Pers.

The sassanian incedent consisted of: "Zoroastrian religious tradition, the legitimacy of hereditary monarchy, racist nationalism and political imperialism. Even the main idea of shahname is political - religious dualism between Iran and Turan. Zarathustra being in the center of history and mythological kings is the sign of the continuation of the Aryan crown and throne of Aryan, pure blood of chivalry by god, which is influenced by godly letter, that is, the official history of Sassanians (the same: 50). All the poetical ontology of Ferdawsi were made as history of kings in which one after the other inheritedly replaced each other on the throne of Iran, from the legendary Kayoumarth to the historical Sassanian Yazdgerd (Istarikef, quoting from SaghibFar, 1377: 277s). In this historic consciousness, the King was in the center of history as the medium of earth and sky, and the protector of the cosmic order on the earth, and the rebels and the opponents of the royal order were counted as the rebels against divine order, the liar, and evil. Thus, Anoshirwan and before him, Darius and Cyrus, have imposed their visions of historical events on the history for centuries describing themselves and their desired order as good and their opponents as evil and lies. Later historians described the riots opposing the Iranism order in ideological terms in the absence of independent sources regarding the love and hatred of kings and instead of the analysis of the history.

What ancient historians have brought in Persian or Arabic about the pre - Islamic history, especially the Mazdak uprising, are based on an important source, Khoday-Name, which has followed events from the perspective of kings and religious scholars and Zoroastrian priests (Noldeka quoting from Cristensen, 1374: 33). This view has directly entered the writings of Islamic historians and authors and they have not had any other source except KhodayName or MazdakName (Khalatbari, 108: Humanities Research). The contents of the Arabic and Persian and the Middle Persian resources is nothing more than sarcasm and cursery (yarshater, kashif, 1362,1/207). For instance, Salibi writes while narrating the story of Mazdak: "the story of Mazdak, the son of Bamdadh curse be upon him" (Salibi quoting from Klima, 1371: 59). Even the Syrianian and Bizantis sources are reproducing the same view of Sasanian government (Yarshater, the same; 207). The main resources of Arabic and Iranian histories, which have recorded the same historical version of Iran were the Arabic translations of KhodayName (the same). They were written by one side of the war front, which is the same Sassanids, after the deracination of Mazdakids and reestablishment of Sasanids order and its content is nothing but curses and excretion.

KhodaiName is the fabrication of the legend by the supreme Persians ethnicity/class after the breakdown of the Median insurgency of Mazdak, which is the main source of Shahnameh. Therefore, what is called the whole spectrum mirror of the Iranian episteme or the philosophy of Iranian history is rewriting Khodainame and not the result of the soul and the mentality of the Iranian so - called ethnic groups, but it is the construction of the super Persian class/clan written exactly against the Kurdish people. If the period of Cyrus is the period of development of Iranian political wisdom and the period of Darius is the era of its consolidation, the period of Anoshirvan and Sasanians in which they composed Khodainame against Mazdak revolt is the period of the development of the Iranian political wisdom. KhodaiName was written by panegyrist of Persian kings, i.e. the Mages in exaggerating the Persian kings, which then poets substituted the Mages in the Samanian period, and poets like Rudaki, Daghighi and Firdausi,

who were the panegyrist-ists of the Samanoan kings recited Khodayname in the new name of ShahName under the format of poetry. Khodainame is the same Persian language composed as the result of the passion after the victory of the Pers over the Mede. It means that the source of all the legends and the philosophy of the Iranian history is the the versification of the Pers victory over the Mede/Kurd. It was after the defeat of the revolt of Median/Mithraist Mazdak that the order to collect and write Avesta was issued. They gathered all the myths and the oral tradition together and they composed it from the viewpoint of the Persian/Zoroastrian rulers.

Khodainame was also the rule of truth after the suppression of lies. The truth was the Persians/Zoroastrian power owners and the lie was the defeated Median/Mithraist people, as those who wrote it were claiming about their own truth and the lies of the others. Therefore, the Iranian text of Khodainame/ShahName lacks any depth and its meaning and depth is in the bottom, in the benefits of the Persian ethnic domination and its hegemonic tools. "The other" of the Pers are the formulated materials taken from Ahriman up to Ajidahak and Turanian and then the ill-mannered Ishmogh, the Medes and the Median Mithra. The authors of the texts stand in one side of the conflict, that is, the Persians, and the texts are not the product of knowledge, but their functions are the production of the power and the elimination of "the other".

Another source that is available about events related to Mazdak is the writing or translation of Ibn Al - Moghafa, which is also in line with the aspersors or dispraisers of Mazdak (the same: 208). MazdakName is not related to the Sasanids or Ashkanids era but to a time in which the joint interests of Zoroastrian and Abbasids in the opposition to Umayyad system required writing one such satire that it is likely Ibn al - Moghafa to be involved in its compilation" (Klima, 1371: 78). The original idea of a populist book of mazdakName is to beware people of the false prophets and ... (the same: 65). The emergence of Khadash which revived the vague memory of Mazdak made east Zoroastrian of Persia to react and call the school of Mazdak as the common enemy of Islam and other faiths, and the idea of the book Mazdakname talks on the false Prophet and innovators (heretics) and ... (the same: 65). There was also Mazdak book in the house of the lords and Muslim nobles (Bagheri, 1378: 196). Ibn Moghafa, on the one side, writes the book Taj about the manners of Anoshirwan, and on the other hand, he translates Mazdak book. Bagheri, in his ignorance of the content of Mazdak's book, and surprised by the work of Rozba who has written both on the manners of Anoshirvan and on Mazdak, the opponents of Anoshirvan, writes: "The Mazdak book has nothing to do with that Mazdak who is a social and communal reformer opposed to the religion of Zoroaster and as the result uncompatible with Islam, too" (the same: 196). He was not aware that the book of Mazdak incidently is in completion of the Book named Jaj on the manners of Anoshirwan. As mentioned earlier, it is in line with foes of Mazdak calling him in improper epithets like false prophet and innovator. As Klima has pointed out the shared interests of Abbasids and Zoroastrians have caused it to be written. Abbasids are in the continuation of Sasanids and Khoramdin are in correspondence with the continuation pattern of Mazdakids.

Therefore, the book "Mazdakname" of Ibn-e Moghafa is the product of an era when "the idea of the Iran world rule was revived by the Abbasids and the Iranian ruler gained Islamic legitimacy" (Garswit, 1385: 223-224). The unity of the Iranian pen/thought with the legitimacy of the Islamic caliphate to counter the common enemy caused the book of Mazdakname to be developed. This book that was written like Khodainame from the political/ideological

viewpoint of the ruling political system against revolutionary movements which, like Khodainame, became the source of Iranian / Islamic historians in writing the history of Mazdak.

Thus, the development of Iranian history and mythology or the Iranian political ration occurred on the calm period after the suppression of the Kurdish revolt of Mazdak in the framework of the official religion of Zoroaster, Khodainame and mazdakName turned into the main source of Islamic era such as Shahname and the Iranian / Islamic historians. Khodainame which later became ShahName, as based on Safa is the whole dimension mirror of the Persian knowledge, or as Tabatabai says, is the foundation of Iranian historical philosophy and the Ajam's Quran developed in contrast to the revolt of Median Mazdak along with its components and through making it as "the other". We will focus on these components in the following:

hus , the identity of Iranian political wisdom was developed in contradiction to the median/Kurdish identity and wills. The word the greater Iran which existed before the Sasanian era was the religious concepts and myths, and it found a political function in the Sasanian time in against to Mazdak's revolt and in contradiction to Aniran (Medi-an/Mithraist mazdak), it moulded on the whole occupied lands by Persian ethnic group/class. This was a religious word and at the hand of the monopoly of the religious text of the Mages. After the Mazdak's revolt in which the Mages achieved some great influences in the Sassanid system, and they developed the apparatus of Zoroastrian ideology and they brought the politics under the monopoly of religion, they turned their own religious sense into the political / territorial concept and they moulded the whole land under the Zoroastrian Persian occupation.

Except for Khodainame and MazdakName, the rest of "the information which is about Mazdak's religion, all are the religious narration of Zoroastrianism" (Cristensen, 1374: 30).

Wandidad in the continuation of "Dive" calling of the Medes/Kurds speaks of impure Mazdak. It has spoken of those who fight with the Istivizat, the devil of death, the impure atheist Mazdak the son of Bamdad, who left the people to hunger and death (Fargard4, article 49 quoting Cristensen, the same; 31).

BahmanYasht, the first part, article 6 to 8: the impure Mazdak, the son of Bamdad who is the enemy of religion and one who violated against the religion of God ... Khosrow Anoshirwan removed him out" (quoted from Cristensen: the same). . BahmanYasht, part 2, article 22: in the kingdom of Khosraw, the son of Kubat, the impure Mazdak left the people away from religion. Dinkard, part 4, article 28: called Khosraw Shah as the ouster and the defeater of the oppressor and the cruelman. Dinkard 31-32, part 7 article 7 and 21: The subject of the speech is about the opponents of the religion and the most atheists called Mazdak" (the same: 32). In the place of historiography, the Islamic historians repeated the same accusations after the reproduction of Iranian order in the political system of Abbasids, and the continuity of Mazdakids in Khoramdinan who were the enemy of Abbasids and Iranian feudals.

Bilyaif knows the accusations of the historians about Mazdak in the Islamic era as the shameless distortions: "The Muslim writers know the Mazdakids in the form of liars, rebels away from morality and licentious and... that the Russian historiographers uncovered the lie of the feudal ideologs of the east regarding Mazdak rituals" (Ra'isNia, 1358: 12). Therefore, what has come to us is not history, but the propaganda of the ruling apparatus for his acquittal and invective of the opposite Mazdakids. Calling Mazdak as unclean and faithless is in the

continuation of calling the Mede and Mithra as dragons and Demon. "The pesenr sources about Mazdak mazdak were developed in the op-posite circles of Mazdak school ... the authors of the east and west have identified the Mazdak school as socially very dangerous and they have considered it obligtory or bound to fight against it and unfortu-anately the authentic texts of Mazdak have been destroyed (Klima, 1359; 19). Our information is insignificant concerning Mazdak due to a small amount of resources. The harsh pursuit has remained nothing out from the writings of Madak, and what we know of them, except in the very few cases, are derived from the words of their foes (Yarshter, the same: 206). The name of M: any did not exist until four centuries after him, and Mony religion was not so dangerous for the society of that time as much as Mazdak's tradition, so the mazdak school was com-pletely put aside" (Klima, 1371: 21-22). The sassanian political system wiped the Mazdakids out in such a way that in the next four centuries the name of Mazdak was not even taken and they erased him from the memory of history. Cristensen knows the collapse of the Mazdakids literature as under the decree of Anoshirwan (RaisNia, the same:9). Anoshirwan also ordered not to mention the name of Mazdak even in historical books, and there is no name of him in the books until the seventh century (NaderShahi, [www.etemaad.ir](http://www.etemaad.ir)).

The distortion of the Iranian ideological apparatus was such that even contemporary oriontaists were no exception in this regard . Gibbon speaks badly about Mazdak. Makom calls him a religious shammer or trickster. Cristensen says: "Mazdak misused the beastlike insticts of the folks to remove the purity of the Aryan nobles and aristocrats (Klima, the same: 167). Noldeka was anti-socialist and proliberalism in the time of Bismark when the socialism spectre was around wandering in Eu-rope. Bismark turned against socialism both theoretically and practical-ly and Noldeka, in return, responde to the curiosity of his time through composing the eastern socialism about Mazdak.

#### Mazdak uprising:

The oriontaists have resented various ideas about Mazdak:Klima in the book " the history of the Mazdakism rite " and Bernits in the book " The Communist Revolution of Mazdak " regarded him as a political / social movement. Althym and Cristensen branded it as a religious movement, the beginning of which was a religious trend that went on to become a social trend (Shipman, 1383: 51). In the book of the histo-ry of Iranians and Arabs in sassanian time and written based on Tabri's book, Noldeka, in an article called " east socialism", has stressed on the religious nature of this movement and he has described Ghobad as a powerful and capable politician interested in Mazdakids religion but his willingness was only to shorten the hand of the elder and master of religion rather than the true belief in that ritual (quoting from yshater, Kashif, 1362/1: 204). He essentially considers the Oriental Socialism as based on the religion (Klima, 1371: 106). Cristensen in a treatise titled "the Kingdom of Peace and Communism" which published in 1925 described the religion of Mazdaki as originally derived from the root of Manawi religion. nspite of Noldeka's view who ascribed the tend-ancy towards Mazdak as the result of his policy to break the power of the great lords, he described Ghobad as a popular king who had tend-ancy towards Mazdaki religion not because of the political and social causes but because of a wish for the prosperity of the poor (Cristensen, 1374: 107). Further, in the book " the history of Mazdak School", Klima assumes the Mazdak's movement as a social movement in the guise of religion and hidden under the theoretical cover of supernatural violent revelutionary Mazdak who intended to eradicate the social sys-tem injustice" (Klima, 1371:



38). Doshen Giman also considers Maz-dak as a communist reformist in the fifth century AD (Gimen quoting from Klima, the same; 16).

Most of the orientaisists have referred to the social and religious aspects of Mazdak's uprising and less to the ethnic aspect of it. However, a question which arises here is that if Mazdak's revolt had a religious and social aspect, why it merely occurred in the west regions of Iran and it did not spread to other parts of Iran which were burning under the yoke of oppression and inequality like the west? Was the ethnic/ tribal dimension of it forgotten according to this fact that Anoshirwan –as Cris-tensen says- had ordered the destruction of all written literature and resources of Mazdakids? We will answer the question in the following, and we will survey on ethnic dimension of the Mazdak uprising apart from its religious and social elements.

There is no doubt that the revolt was more social / economic and it was a so - called communist struggle (not in its Marxist / caste sense), but it must not be forgotten that the principle reason for the conflict between Median Mazdak and Persian Anoshirwan has been an ethnic conflict. Due to the fact that the dominant ethnic/class Persians had become the dominant and aristocratic class because of the plundering of surplus and the accumulation of the Medes/Kurds capitals and the rest of the other tribes, the Medes turned into the inferior class and they were in the state of slavery in comparison to the Persians. Also, as the result of the political strength and the economic plunderings, the Persians changed into the superior ethnic/class group enjoying the monopoly of happiness and revelry and the Medes were deprived from the pleasures and beauty of the world, the Median/Kurdish uprising of Mazdak had taken on the class or the so - called communist and the pleasure aspect. While the ethnic conflict was going on between Pers/Kurds that in terms of time and for the reasons we have noted, its social / ceremonial aspect was more evident than its ethnic dimension. Inequalities and injustice reigned in all political boundaries of the kingdom of Iran, but why did the pro - equality uprising of Mazdakism spread only in western Iran? "Mazdak school developed as an independent movement in the western states of the Sasanids kingdom (Klima, 1371: 109). Mazdak movement - in the word of Nemani- was developed in west of Iran and did not spread to other parts of Iran. Mazdak revolt took place in Sawad and Madaen and did not spread to other parts of Iran (Khosrawi, 1359: 7). After their defeat, the centre of Mazdakian became the nearby areas of Dinawar and Azerbaijan (the Minor Mede) , and after their defeat they went to the Jibal or the mountains (the same: 46). 46 Ibn al - Balkhi also pointed out that the Mazdak movement found a great glory in Azerbaijan - the Minor Mede. The Maz-dak movement emerged only in the human geography of Kurdistan and was specific to the Kurdish people.

We noted that the contrast between Iran/Pers with Kurd/Mede was not only ethnic / political but also conceptual/religious and we showed the conceptual contrast of Pers/Mede in the form of concepts such as cosmic justice against equality justice, religious/metaphysical culture versus Dionysian/earthly (anti-) culture heavenly/divine legitimacy versus earthly/contractual legitimacy. Furthermore, we will survey on the contradiction of the Pers with the Mede in the historical event of the struggle between Sasanids with Mazdakids, Anoshirwan with Mazdak under the framework of the processed concepts which are the abstraction of the ethnic/ political contrasts.

The Mazdak movement has several key elements :

1- Equality and a fair division of property among all people , and the destruction of class structure and the power of the landlords and aristocracy.

2 – The right of having pleasure and freedom for all having roots in the equality for all the people, and the struggle with the monopoly of pleasure for the aristocracy and the generalization of it.

3 The fight against the cosmic order of religion Zoroaster and the de-struction of fire temples and ultimately the revival of power and free-dom of the Medes from under the ruling yoke of the Persians .

In contrast, the Iranian/Sasanids political reason negated Mazdakism and it was reconstructed based on a number of components:

1- The reproduction of class justice and monopoly of property in the hands of nobles and priests .

2-The monopoly of pleasure in the hands of the aristocrat class and the general deprivation of people from pleasure and sexual equality.

3- The revival of the religion of Zoroaster and fire temples and the cod-ification of the Zoroastrian doctrine through the unity of the religion of Zoroastrianism and the despotic government of the Sassanid dynasty and finally, the revival and establishment of the Persians power against the Medes' revolt and insurgencies.

In what follows, we will investigate each of these components, and the reaction of the political reason of Sasanians/Anoshirwan against maz-dak's actions.

Mazdak زن و مرد از آن پس یکی شد به رأي پرستار و مزدور با کدخدای

's Socialist Justice against the cosmic justice of Anoshirvan:

The Mazdak school, in essence, is not a religion in the true meaning of the word, but we can talk of its religious cortex cover (Klima, 1371: 163). There is a radical revolutionist Mazdak under the cover of super-natural theory of Mazdak that aimed to address and resolve the injustice of the social system (the same: 38). It is not Mazdak's belief that gave him value near his followers but his social morality (Widingern, 1377: 424). Mazdak is the first real socialist in the history of the man-kind (Wherry, 1882: 66). One of the main objectives of the Mazdak was to deny social injustice and to disrupt the class structure of society. "For this reason, the priests in Anoshirwan court called Mazdak atheist and Goddamned, whose aims were 1- the creation of equality 2 - negation of the confiscation of women and property 3-the disruption of class structure 4- the rejection of contradictions in the society and in a word he aimed at undermining the class coalition" (Khosrawi, 1359: 43).

He wanted to discourage animosity, hatred and conflict, and he knew it as a result of the woman or the secular demand ( Kristensen, 1374: 90)s. If inequality is inappropriate, theft and adultery should also be acceptable as a reaction against this inequality (Zarinkob,1368: 481). Theft and adultery is a negated issue that destroys a negative element, a barking dog is needed up to the pint when there is a thief. Therefore, the cause of theft is the exclusive ownership and inequality. This sort of theft and adultery had been banished and despised in reality and in an order in which it was an unpopular reality that must be negated. In-deed, what is known as the

theft and adultery in Mazdak is nothing but the return of the stolen property and women. Actually, Pers aristocrats have been robbers who have seized the property and the capital excesses of the Medes; as the result, the Medes have tried to regain their stolen property.

Mazdak regarded the property and pleasure the same as the air and earth owned by all equally. As the existing order would not allow the achievement of the equal rights and division of property, he tried to attain social demands through the revolution and revolt. In the continuation of the revolt of Gaumates, Mazdak took away the property and pleasures in the monopoly of the upper classes, and divided among them all. Following the suppression of the Mazdak, the aristocrats and the clergy, who wrote history, called Mazdak as the sordid, nefarious and evil Ishmog in the continuation of the lying and evil calling of the Median revolt.

It was because knowledge that represented Anoshirvan and nobility as good and Mazdakids as was produced by them and it was in the service of their own domination and power; in fact, the ideology of the existing order and the produced knowledge was in the service of political power and it has had a political function.

During Sassanian period, the Iranian society was based on two pillars: property and blood. According to the Tansar's letter, a solid obstacle divided the nobility and from the populace (Kristen, 1378: 228). The condition of the peasantry was no difference from the aristocrat's behaviours, the subjects sometimes gave taxes to the government, some-times to the nobility, and sometimes to both them. They were the infantry of the corps with no wages (the same: 232). The main source of the Sassanian income was the tax on farmers or slaves, not the mere production and it was consumed on building the palaces (Khosrawi, 11: 1359). the sassanian foreign policy was also based on war and looting (the same: 16). The government / empire of the Sassanids was in the service of the Persian ruling class/ethnic group who plundered the property and resources of other people including Medes and put it in the service of the Persians. Ardashir-e Babakan considered the tribute as the pillar of the country (Tabari, Vol.2: 626). Kubat termed the court of tribute that was based on the looting of the property of farmers and needy people in favour of the aristocracy as the Court of Justice. (the same: 11). The nobilities, priests and the Sassanid dynasty each had the big seragilios (harems) and they limited the monopoly of women and pleasures in their own classes. They injected and infused mysticism into the lower classes so as to expect them austerity and piety. Mazdak's sin was badged as injustice and villain Ishmog because against brought the looted property back to their rightful owners, that is, the public.

The revolt and larceny was justified well in Shahnameh:

سخنگوي با دانش و راي و کام    بيامد يکى مرد مزدک به نام  
قياد دلاور بدو داد گوش    گر انمايه مردی و دانش فروش

نگهبان آن گنج و گنجور گشت    به نزد جهاندار دستور گشت  
ميان کهان و ميان مهان ز خشکی خورش تنگ شد در جهان  
به ايران کسی برف و باران ندید    ز روی هوا ابر شد ناپدید

همی هر کسی آب و نان کرد یاد      مهان جهان بر در کیقباد  
 نماید شما را به امید راه      بدیشان چنین گفت مزدك كه شاه  
 چنین گفت كاي نامور شهریار      دوان اندر آمد بر شهریار  
 گر ایدونك پاسخ دهی اندکی      به گیتی سخن پرسم از تو یکی  
 به من تازه كن در سخن آبروي      قباد سراینده گفتش بگوي  
 همی از تنش جان بخواهد پرید      بدو گفت آن كس كه مارش گزید  
 گزیده نیابد ز تریاك بهر      یکی دیگری را بود پای زهر  
 تریاك دارد درم سنگ بیست      سزاي چنین مرد گویی كه چیست  
 كه خونی است این مرد تریاكدار      چنین داد پاسخ ورا شهریار  
 ...به درگاه چون دشمن آمد به مشت      به خون گزیده بیایدش كشت  
 خرامان بیامد ز پیش قباد چو بشنید مزدك زمین بوس داد  
 كه جایی كه گندم بود در نهفت به درگاه او شد به انبوه گفت  
 بدان تا یكایك بیایید بهر      دهید آن به تاراج در كوي و شهر  
 به تاراج گندم شدند از بنه دودیند هر كس كه بد گرسنه

كه تاراج كردند انبار شاه قباد آن سخنگوي را پیش خواند چنین داد پاسخ كانوشه بدی سخن هرچه  
 بشنیدم از شهریار به شاه جهان گفتم از مار و زهر بدین بنده پاسخ چنین داد شاه اگر خون این مرد  
 تریاكدار چو شد گرسنه نان بود پای هزر شكم گرسنه چند مردم بمرد

به مزدك همی باز گردد گناه

تاراج انبار چندی براند عقل را به گفتار توشه بدی بگفتم به بازآریان خوار خوار از آن يكس كه  
 تریاك دارد به شهر كه تراكدار است مرد گناه بریزد کسی نیست با او شمار به سیری  
 ...نخواهد ز تریاك بهر كه انبار را سود جانش نبرد

Mazdak resembles hoards and storehouses of the nobility to the man who holds the antidote but he does not give it to the dying man; thus, Kubat decreed to take the antidote from him by force. The revolution-ary wrath of Mazdak was also the result of the refusal of the upper classes to give the antidote ( bread and wheat ) to the lower classes who were starving due to hunger and famine.

Mazdak's political thought in pre-modern time

We have already noted that the main subject of the Mede identity is Mithra, meaning contract / paradise; contract is the negation of guardi-an and political domination of ethical and metaphysical general princi-ples on the individual. Contract / Paradise is the main subject of re-structuring Kurdish political thought. This thought indicates that the totality of the state is not beyond or over the individual but it is the outcome of agreement and contract among individuals. The totality of society cannot be based on the elimination of individual and his desires but the right of the person is prior to the totality of the society. Mo-rover, the sacred and metaphysical totality is beyond the earthly/body and political rights and desires of the people and this, in turn, does not exist beyond the understanding of the individuals. The actual and tan-gible demands of the people, who they themselves are able to under-stand them and the others do not tell them, will link the contract to the paradise, i.e. the earthly paradise. The classical political thought has sacrificed the individual and individual interests to the general inter-ests of the politics under the name of the delusional heavenly paradise. In contrast, the political thought of the Kurd, illustrated in Mazdak, denotates that paradise exists in this same world and the way to actual-ize it is not the prayer and the caress or combat in the way of God/Ahora but through actions and in the way of the individuals themselves. The actualization of paradise in the world involves con-tract, that is, the negation of the political dominaton and the realization of the equality.

Mazdak's thought was in contrary to the common thoughts of the old world. It means that the prophets and moral reformers in the old world were always addressing the lords of power, the nobility, and the King to observe the rights of the people and to be generous and just. However, Mazdak, as in the new thought , addressed not to the powerful people, but to the negligible people to take their own rights. This statement that" ritht must be taken not given" is quite appropierate about Mazdak's revolutionary fury. The sin of Mazdak's violence was due to the theft of the nobility; when there is no law and court to reclaim the right, and when it is not possible to restore the right within the existing order, then the bases of justice must be estab-lished by the Revolution and the breaking of the existing order. The foundation of the Iranian / Persian empire is in the service of the inter-ests of the Persian ethnicity and it is not possible to gain freedom and justice except by passing through the body of the Iranian government. The iraninan government is a single - ethnic state in the service of the Persian interests; there is no other remedy for the creation of justice and freedom except the destruction of such a system.

Revolution is a modern concept. There is no room for revolution and change in the classic political thought in which the political/earthly order is in the continuation of cosmic order, and the oppositions of the current order are devil and sham and ... . However, in the modern thought started with Makyawell and the contract followers, the political order splited from the divine and cosmic order and the human mind replaced Sharia and god in guiding life , and the will of the human beings took the place of the gods and sacred things vanished into the air.

Metaphysics disappeared and with his own will, the man called for the realization of paradise in this same world. Para-dise realization was subject to changing the status quo which it could not be possible except by revolution and disruption of the social class structure. Nevertheless, can we deduce the same results in the thoughts of Msazdak?

As we said before, Mazdak wanted to reject the differences, hatreds and struggles and he knew the existence of such phenomena as the re-sult of the women and earthly desires (Cristensen, 1374: 90). This issue is reflected in ShahName, too.

بیچاند از راستی پنج چیز

کجا رشک و کین است و خشم و نیاز

تو چون چیره باشی بر این پنج دیو از این پنج مار از زن و خواسته ست زن و خواسته باشد اندر میان

که دانا بر این پنج نفزود نیز به پنجم که گردد برو چیره از پدید آیدت راه کیهان خدیو که دین بهی  
..در جهان کاسته ست چو بهی را نخواهی زیان

Mazdak saw the root of conflict and hatred in envy, desire and greed. However, contrary to the view of religion and morality seeking these things as a cause in the instinct of man, and wanting to suppress them, Mazdak did not consider the envy and greed as the inherent nature of man, but as the effect of society and its inequalities. Instead of sup-pressing the desires and wishes of the human, he wanted to change the structure of society in their favor. He regarded the root of envy, not in the biological nature of man, but also in the inequality in the division of property and woman; through the equal divisions of women sex equality) property ( primary communism ), the cause of envy , conflict , and dispute will be removed. Mazdak has placed the principle in man and his desires, that is, the natural environment of man , and wants to reject the dominance of the totality of the society and its rules on the personal lives of individuals. The ideology dominating the Sasanids society and the Zoroastrianism tried to justify the social inequality and class order. It wanted to suppress the human beings and its desires in the waMy of adapting to the class justice of the society because the class justice was to the benefits of the Persian ruling class/ethnicity and Zoroaster's reli-gion was its justifying ideology. Unlike this, Mazdak wanted to liberate the human lives and to adapt the society based on the volition of the in-dividuals. From Mazdak's viewpoint, the totality of society must be based on the desires and wills of individuals not based on the cosmic order or the rules of religion and metaphysics, since the totality of the society is not in accordance with the desires of the people and the Mazdak's movement. It is only possible to restore the right through the removal of the totality of the existing order. Mazdakism has no belief in God and the Hereafter and the hands of God or fate to take refuge in the mysticism or the hands of divine destiny by prayer. The paradise of

Mazdak is in this world and the solution towards its realization is through revolution and practice. In Mazdak's viewpoint, the will of man precede the structure of the society and the right of the individual is superior to the religious and customary sanctities, which we will elaborate further below.

#### Mazdak's Socialism based on individualism

Mazdak's socialism is not classless socialism or without private possession; it is not government socialism, too. Mazdak's socialism means equal right of all to private property, i.e. the equal right to all classes over private property and sexual freedom and the possibility of having asset and pleasure for all. This right is not pre-determined and eternal; this right is not given, it must be taken. All should have access to property and pleasure equally. The property is not a gift on behalf of the government or blood or being Lord. Individual as individual has the right of property. Ownership has many limitations and its limitations are lack of ownership by "the other". If the ownership of someone is to the point that it makes obstacle for the ownership of the other, it must be denied. The sacralty of private ownership was the reason of Mazdak's revolutions. The general property of the state and the aristocracy prevented the realization of private property; hence, the revolution took place to reestablish the state of private property. Finally, it should be noted that the main purpose of Mazdak was not socialism but ethnic and individual liberty and this is not possible but through ethnic collective freedom and rejection of the domination of the other ethnic groups. But since the Persians had been transformed into the superior ethnic group via looting and theft of the Median property and ..., it took the shape of caste and communist revolt, and the Medes became the lower and inferior class and the Persians were the dominant upper classes.

Under the framework of ancient thinking including in the political reason of Iran, the ruling order was a divine and eternal order defined in accordance with the cosmic order. Any objection to this order is to protest against the cosmic/divine order, and to be in line with lies and evil so that individuals must constrain and even suppress their wants and their instincts in accommodating this cosmic order. The religion and culture of society also reflects the aims and interests of the upper classes; it internalizes the political dominance within the people which is merely based on the naked force. But Mazdak wants to reconcile the totality of society with the desire and wishes of man. From Mazdak's viewpoint, the political and social order must be consistent with the wishes of the people. Therefore, the political order involves no pre-defined and existing rule that individuals must conform themselves to it; thus, the nature and the law of the political order are defined by the individuals and their aspirations.

Mazdak had to communicate by reason with the ruling order as that reason itself was a part of the ruling order; it wanted to preserve it and it was nothing but the reflection of the existing caste / ethnic interests .

Therefore, there was no way for any exchange of views and dialogue between Mazdak and his "the other". That is why he took action instead of using his speech and pen. Mazdak said, " The thought and speech are unimportant things, what difference does it make for people to worship: the fire of Persians, the book of the Jews or the stones of Hons? All of these are the different shapes of searching the truth; is the shape of something other than apparent clothing? and does

the search of nothing mean anything?; thus, honesty is only in action. It is possible to sacrifice the shape even though it is beautiful. The nature of man has made men equal, so we must return to the truth of the primal times" (Mazdak quoted from Simashko, Sahabi, 1387: 93-94). The idea cannot plow a field. Good speech teaches good deeds and appropriate manner rises from bread and woman" (the same: 95). Mazdak knows the principle on action, that is, a revolutionary act. Mazdak rebels and the cause of his revolt is in the inequality of society, "the people starve to death, and our stores are filled. The bed of the people is cold, and our bedchambers and seragalias are full of the lazy women" (the same, 90). Mazdak struggles rather than surrender and tries to change the outside world in opposition to Irfan which is unable to change the world outside and it takes refuge in the vacancy of the internal world and it transforms whatsoever the hands of fate disposes from them into the inner world of souls (Lokasch, the same: 33).

Instead of going to heaven, Mazdak is trying to realize paradise in this world. The nature of Mazdak is tragic, tragedy - according to Kaufman, shows its nature in action and not in speech. For this reason, "he knows the truth only in Karma". "The tragic self (ego) is silent and has to show itself through action, tragic heroes are full of action and show their conflict with the outside world through action, the tragic hero is the same with his own actions (FarhadPour, 1385, 244). Mazdak wants to realize paradise in this same world because the nature of tragedy is a landmark miracle and the truth of the soul is the mere essence of tragedy, as the obliteration of the soul is the only essence of mysticism. The experience of mysticism means the submission and acceptance of the totality, but the tragic experience means the creation of the universe and the totality. The submission is the way of the mystic man and the struggle is the way of the tragic man. The first is absorbed at the end of his way and the latter is crushed in the face of the whole and it is broken (Lokasch, FarhadPour, 1385: 43). Instead of being digested in the whole community and its ideology, Mazdakids treated it and they were finally shattered.. Mazdakids want to disrupt the totality of the society and rebuild it in accordance with the wishes and desires of the people.

Anoshirwan: cosmic justice and rejection of the equality of the individuals

After his return to power, Mazdak has not shown great satisfaction with Mazdak and Mazdakids and he has given a green light for their suppression. Against the opinion of Cristensen who considers Ghobad's attitude towards Mazdak as arising from his philanthropy, Noldeka, Klima and Zarinkob know the attitude of Kubat to Mazdak as resulting from his resourcefulness in reducing the power of the aristocrats and focusing on their own power. The "genocide" in "Amed", and the way to retake the rule of the monarchy and sacrifice of the Mazdakids for the succession of Khosraw ... deny the peacemaking and justice-seeking manner of Kubat, and the words of those who reject Ghobad's tendency towards Mazdak not a the result of breaking the power of the nobility, but his justice seeking character ... are baseless (ZarinKob, 1368: 482-483). The tendency of Mazdak by Kubat was solely due to the instrumental use of him to break down the power of the aristocracy and priests on the way to centralization of power monopoly power in the royal hand of Kubat. His actions were directed to strengthen his own power, and the responses of the slave-like classes -Mazdak- before slavemaking feudalism was in agreement with the political plans of Kubat (the same: 483). Mazdak also raised for a while because of meeting the demands of the first Kowad to crush the annoyers of his power, but finally, because of the lack of ideological and governance



feature, it broke down through an opposition coup (Karbasiyan, 1384: 17). Therefore, the actions of Ghobad in support of Mazdak were only tactic not strategy. The nature of the authority of the Iranian monarchy whether Ghobad or Khosraw based on hierarchy and monopoly of power conflicted with Mazdakism nature which struggled to share any monopoly of power and property. This tactical use of religious and social movements for the elimination of opponents and the centralization of power in the case of Manawiat is also true. "When the Sasanian resulted in re-ligious centralization from political centralization was due to this fact that Manawit did not fulfill the authoretrian desires of this state and it turned into an opposition religion (Gerigorij, Raza , 1365, 118 -131).

After returning to power, Anoshirwan restored the pattern of Iranian political order; however, Mazdakism raised communist justice in contrast to the science of class/Platonic justice.

چنين گفـت کـسـري بـه پيش گـروه بـه مزدک کـهـاي مـرد دـانش پـژوه يکـی دین نو سـاختی پـر زیـان نـهادي  
زن و خواسته در میان

چو مـردم سـراسـر بـود در جـهان کـه بـاشد کـه جـويد در کـهـتري کـسی کـاو مـرد جـاي و چـيزش کـه راسـت جـهان  
زین سخن پاک ویران شد همه کنخدایند و مزدور کیست

دین آوران این سخن کس نگفت همه مردمان را به دوزخ بري 761.

نـبـاشد پـيدا کـهان و مـهان چـگونه تـوان يـافتن مـهـتري کـه شـد کـارجـو بـنده بـا شـاه راسـت نـبـاید کـه اـين بـد  
بـه اـيران شـد هـمـه گـنج دـارند و گـنجـور کـيست تـو ديوـانگی دـاشـتی در نـهـفت هـمـيکـار بـد را بـه بـد  
...نـشـمري

The reform of Anoshirvan was the result of the Mazdak's revolt (Shipman, 1383: 58). Based on the words of Anoshirvan to Mazdak, Mazdak's actions and Khosraw's reaction against him will become obvious. As Khosraw has pointed out, Mazdak's reforms has vanquished the conflict between the lower and the upper chamber and has placed the village Elder and the mercenary in one place. In other words, the master - slave interface and class order have been removed. These fact that Anoshirvan in addressing mazdak says: " You'll cause all the people go to hell / You don't see bad action as bad", is a sign of the difference in ideological and political values of Mazdak and Anoshirvan. The badnesses of Anoshirvan and Iranian ration becomes the goodness of Mazdak and vice versa.

...نـبـاشد خـردمـند و خـسـرو پـرسـت چـو بـيـداد جـويد يکـی زير دسـت

The purpose of Anoshirvan is to restore the class order and maintain distance between the lowers and highers and the village elders and merceneries. By addressing Mazdak and telling

him that you are taking all the people to the hell calling, Anoshirvan considers himself the representative of the truth and justice. "Dad" in Iran did not mean to-day's justice but it is the divine law. (1377: 168).

The significance of Asha or the truth in the political ration of Iran is not truthfulness, but Saman or the organization and the system of crea-tion (the same: 244). Neiberg and Doshingiman truly see the truth as the cosmic law and universal order. The celestial order is the pattern of the ground order, and the social and political institutions are the mate-rial realization of the divine and the religious Minoes (epistemes) (the same: 245). The king or the emperor, too, is the ground symmetry of Ahura Mazda in cosmic order and the revolt against the emperor is the rebellion against Ahura Mazda and the divine order. Therefore, the emperor wants absolute obedience of his followers. In Tansar's letter, there is no virtue or property greater than always serving the kings in a humble way (the same: 44). He also writes: "There is nothing worse in the world than to use the minors instead of majors(tansar's letter, quot-ed from Bagher, 1378: 207). The emphasis of Tansar on maintaining class distinctions seems to be a sign of the reaction against Mazdak's ideas (Yarshater, Kashif, 1362, 215/1), especially that, contrary to the opinion of some scholars who consider Tansar as living in the time of Ardashir, Cristensen rightly ascribed him to the periods of Anoshirvan because there some refeences to Mazdak's uprising in Tansar's letter. "Tansar's letterhas been written down after the conquests of Anoshirvan, that is, between the years 557 and 570 AC (Cristensen, 1387: 107).

Two great aspects of the Sassanians were the concentrated power and the establishment of official religion (Cristansen, 1378: 68). The King 's duty as a symbol of the good religion and the power of the empire is the protection of the integrity and cosmic order (the same: 246). The obedience to the King equals to the truth and the violation of his or-ders corresponds to his own shortcomings and lies (the same: 246). The obedience to the King and the loyalty to him is the most important manifestation of truth and honesty and judgment about the justice of the King is beyond the jurisdiction of the people (the same: 257). The secret to regard Kurds from Gothis to Mazdakids as devil, dragon ad Ishmogh was their rebels against class justice of society, kingdom sacracry and defending social justice and people's will. "Mazdak was the ultimate source of the badness of the government and its lack of equality, the Mazdak movement was not a religious preaches to act negatively, but it was publicly opposed to the feudal government and it had a liberalizing aspect and agricultural democracy (Diakonof, 1364: 340).

By co - ordinating the aristocrats with the clergy, Anoshirvan ended the Mazdakism revolution (Shipman, Jahandary, 1383: 54). After sup-pressing Mazdakism, he reorganized the society and revived class divi-sion. His reforms brought the property back to the nobles (Diakonof, 1364, 346).

زن و زاده و باغ و آراسته بزرگان شدند ایمن از خواسته

In the Sassanid society, the rigid and solid ceremonies of the classes or groups were the rulers, since the religion of Zoroastrianism was supporting the class society (Frye, 1344: 375). Shah had to be from Sassanid dynasty and had divine power. Religion divided all men - except slaves - into four classes, and the government supported this sacred division. The transition from one class to another was not possible, which included priests, the armies, the teachers and the tax payers, most of the peasants were free people (Ivanov and ..., Izadi, 1349: 161). The first three classes did not pay tributes (the same: 161), of which the members of the first three strata were mostly from the Persians ruling ethnic group and the slaves and infantries were from the Medes and the other ethnic groups. Khosraw the first gave financial aid to aristocratic families who had become poor as the result of Mazdak's movement (the same: 170). He established the principles and fundamentals of feudal ruling system (Diakonov, Rohi Arbab, 1364: 346). The general rules of the Sassanians were for the constabulary of the family and property to maintain the privilege of the classes (Cristensen, 1378, 242). Therefore, the whole of Sasanian laws developed in against and in negation of Mazdak's movement. It means that Mazdak's movement shattered the authority foundation of the upper classes belonging to the Persians and divided their properties and possessions among the Medes, and Anoshirvan sought to restore the power of the upper classes and to establish the ethnicity/class of the superior Persian power against encroaching the Medes. In contrast to Mazdak's collective revolution, Anoshirvan sanctified via law to preserve the aristocratic wealth and privileges, and he described it as cosmic/Ahorai order whose opponents are evil and irreligious which are definitely the Mazdakids' opponents.

Anoshirvan restored the kind of order prior to the Mazdakids revolution. This order involved the hierarchical order centered on the central signifier of divine Farah, and hierarchical justice with religious ideology in order to preserve the Persian power. The same two groups of nobles and clerics, who broke the Median Astiag government down in support of Cyrus and the same two groups that frustrated the uprising of Gaumates in support of Darius, caused Anoshirvan's supremacy over Mazdak. "Aristocrates' company along with clerics put an end to Mazdakids revolution" (Shipman, 1383: 54). The concept of monarchy and Sasanians religious policy like Achaemenids were based on clerics and nobles (Newly, 1381: 258). In Sasanians era, the nobles and the aristocrats of the tribes were abreast of each other (Wishofer, 1377: 218).

Iranian society is the pure aristocratic society and only the upper classes are regarded as the representatives of this society (the same: 356). The upper classes were also the superior Persian clan. Khosraw the first brought the robbed properties back to their owners (Girishman, 364). The properties and the real states of the aristocrats were given back to them under the decree of Anoshirvan, and the new administrative and military aristocracy was established (Wishofer, 1377: 218). Anoshirvan killed all the followers of Mazdak from around Jazir to Nahravan and Mada'n in only one day, which counted more than a hundred thousand (Cristensen, 1378: 88). After the suppression of Mazdak, the priests, i.e. the protectors of the Sasanian aristocracy entitled Anoshirvan as Anoshirvan the just (Khosravi, 1359:). The master of speech have spoken about the Iranian peasanteries (nobles) in the following way:

به داد و دهش یافته نام و کام همش داد بود و همش رای و نام

On the contrary to Mazdak, hierarchical / class justice and the totality of government / god preceded the rights of individuals in Iranian politics. Justice was not defined as based on the rights of individuals and equality, but it was defined based on the cosmic order in the continuation of divine order in which Shah (king) is the earthly correspondance of Ahura Mazda and the people must be obedient to the God on earth. In contrast to the political thought of Mazdakism/Mithraism in which God is defined as product of the creation of the contract between people not split from the government and equality justice; however, in the Persian / Zoroastrianism political thought, God is discredited of government / people and projected onto the sky to fill unpopular acceptance with heavenly legitimacy.

The monopoly of Anoshirvan pleasure against equality pleasure of Mazdak (Zoroaster's celestial paradise versus Mithra's earthly (terrestrial) paradise

The Sassanid aristocratic society had the pleasure and desire under his monopoly, and it expected the self - control and the suppression of instincts from the lower classes through injecting mysticism and under the name of the heavenly paradise. What researchers say about sexual lechery is nothing but sexual equality and the right of common use of pleasure and hedonism, or the same Mithra/paradise. We previously said that Mithra was a Mede/Kurd creed and it was neither a religion nor a metaphysical worshipable deity. Mithra meant contract / paradise. The contract is the earthly/agreemental political order and the paradise was the realization of the heaven in this same world with the humanly will, not the Godly prayers. We now reproduce Mithra/paradise in Mazdak's uprising against the metaphysical restrictions under the heavenly paradise. We will survey on the Mazdak's Mithra/contract against the divine right of the Persian kings in the following.

He did not want to be promiscuous or he did not intend to destroy the family. On the contrary, Ibn Nadeem talked about the respect of marriage among them (quoted by Yarshater, the same: 230). Mazdak considered the development of the family and having pleasure as the right for everyone. Since the existing order had taken the realization of this right for all, every riot against this order was called as profligacy and disorder. In the framework of the existing order, there was no possibility of taking such a right from the aristocracy, and the upper classes possessed the monopoly of women; hence, there was no possibility of actualizing this right except through assault on the seraglio of aristocrats and priests. Sexual freedom in Mazdakism can not be separated from his justice-seeking idea. The equality of all with regard to the property and women is defined in the framework of equal rights for all in utilizing the enjoyment. Of course, this does not mean the denial of Mazdakism belief in sexual freedom and preference of body and instinct over the wisdom in which Mazdak defines happiness and hedonism as the good religion while the suppression of instincts and happiness is considered as the good religion in Iranian political wisdom.

...

از این پنج ما را زن و خواستست زن و خواسته باید اندر میان

...که دین بهی در جهان کاستست چو دین بهی را نخواهی زیان

What can be inferred from the Mazdakids teachings in Ferdaosi's po-ems is that Mazdak has a definition in against the norms of the good religion. The whole old religious and philosophical thought from Zoroaster to Plato know the good religion as the preference of the spirit over the body and the suppression of the instincts or the " a rogue (bolter or chamomile) horse." But Mazdak regards the good religion as sharing of the women and property. It means that if the woman is the root of envy and conflict in society, instead of repressing the related instincts and desires, they must be let free and the women and the desires should be in everybody's disposal. These not be made possible except through infridgment and passion as in the word of the enemies of Mazdak. As we have already said , it is the totality of society that needs to be formed according to the desires and aspirations of the individual , rather than this point that individuals adapt their instincts to the general values of society. The meaning of common sharing in Mazdakism is not common use of women or property, but the right to general utilization of them equally. That is to say that all classes of society, free from belong-ing to all classes and castes have equal rights to enjoy the properties and pleasures, so that all categories of society have equal rights in all aspects of life, and have the ability to marry and enjoy life, which the woman stands for it. Further, sexual freedom means having freedom of choice in the form of relations outside of the religious and moral restraints, and there should only be the constraint of consent and agreement (contract).

In fact, the common use of the property and women and freeing the instincts, on the condition of not harming others, is the realization of heaven in this same world and with the will of the human being. Since the realization of heaven / paradise, meaning free use of pleasure and hedonism, requires equality of the people and the equality of the people involves denial of political and social domination, biological and world-ly freedom is not possible without political freedom and the rejection of the domination to such components Ibn Nadim have referred in Mazdak's thought.

Nadim divides Khoramnia into two groups and speaks of the ancient Mazdak and recent Mazdak (Yarshater, Kashif, the same: 210). The group that are called "Mahmara" are in Azerbaijan and Dinawar and Hamedan and Esfahan and they are a community known as AlGhita (found children) whose founder is Mazdak who said: seek the enjoyment, use the joys of life, do not take harsh on yourselves in consuming the foods and drinks and seek the equality and friendship and avoid controlling each other (emphasis from me, Qadri)" ( Ibn Nadim, quoting from Cristensen, the same: 94).

In the opinion of Ibn Nadeem, this Mazdak emerged in the era of Ghobad and was killed along with all of his followers in the hands of Khosro Anoshirvan (quoting from Yarshater, the same: 210). Any one who who wants more woman or a commodity, he does not have more rights than the others (Sa'alibi, quoting from Yarshater, the same). If we extract the elements of Mazdakism from these texts, there are nothing but pleasure, i.e. earthly pleasure and enjoying the joy and food, equality and liberty. The four forces which Mazdak uses against four categories of society, unlike Plato and Zoroaster, do not relate to the clergy and the wisdom and ... but it is connected to " the understanding, happiness, joy, optimism and love of life" (Khosravi, 1359: 29).

The equality idea of Mazdak itself negates the racial and caste concepts. "He rejected the differences of classes and he agreed with the marriage of the women with the men from other classes, he probably deprecated the wives and the tradition of establishing the seraglio, and he allowed the unmarried women to get married to the single man (Yar-shater, the same: 217). He opposed the imprisonment of women in the trap of aristocracy (Khosrawi, 36). It means that, in the one hand, he wants the general use of the women/pleasure, and on the other, he seeks to reject the domination, the monopoly and the equal rights to all.

It might be inferred that the woman, similar to property, should be shared among all. We can infer from this idea that Mazdak towards woman is instrumental and he regards the woman as goods. However, the remaining texts from the Mazdakids' approach to women rule out such an impression. In the Sassanid community, the woman was not anything more than a commodity in which the nobles had the right to have several women, and the main struggle of Mazdak was with the monopoly of women that was in the hands of certain classes that everyone had the right to use them. But is this use unconditional like goods?

The words of the majority of the Islamic sources regarding Mazdakians/Khoramdinan are restricted to the controversial statements about the withdrawal of religious duties, non - Islamic beliefs and the impunity in sexual affairs. However, two of them, Nawbakhti and maghdasi, give useful information regarding the principles of their beliefs and the religious creeds. Among the Khoramdinan beliefs, we can count: " they believed in the relationship with the women on the condition of their satisfaction, and also they believed in liberty in adhering to the pleasures and satisfaction of all desires so far as not to harm the others (the emphasis is mine)" (Maghdasi quoting Yarshater, the same: 228). If we pay attention to this narrative of Mazdakian and Khoramian, from one side, they believed in the freedom of pleasure and the fulfillment of all desires (Mitra / Paradise), on the other side, the condition of consent precedes the condition of pleasure (Mitra /contract). Though, the principle is based on the pleasure and fulfillment of all desires, it is only one condition that limits pleasure, and that condition is neither morality nor religion, nor the predetermined metaphysical sanctity, but the only limit is not bothering the other or the same consent and agreement. Therefore, the two basic principles of Mazdak doctrine are pleasure and consent, and with existing the other's consent ( woman or ... ), there is no pre - defined constraint to limit the existing instincts and pleasures (compared with the discussions related to Mithra in previous chapters). As the result, if the female was considered a commodity in Mazdakism, the condition of consent was meaningless. Goods can be used in what-soever ways. The use of goods does not require consent. "The women have the right to choose in Mazdakism" (Khosrawi, the same: 37). The right to choose for the woman is to admit the value of an independent existence to the woman, independent of the man, Khan (chiftman), the family, the tradition and pedigree ...,that is, to save women from all customs, religious, patriarchal and tribal norms and decisions of Mazdak. He abolished the marriage of the Chakari and Stori in which it obliged the widow, the sister or the daughter of a dead man to undergo the marriage with one of paternal relatives of the deceasedman with no rights to marry (Yarshater, the same: 217). He developed the financial regulation and the laws of marriage, he deprecated the multiplicity of wives, and the custom of the seraglio and he separated the marriage from being based on the class. (the same: 216).

Anoshirvan's reaction:

After suppressing the Mazdak's uprising, Anoshirvan revived the order prior to Mazdak and frustrated the Mazdakids' reforms. In the words of Noldeka, most of the reveration of Anoshirvan was because of him suppressing Mazdak (Klima, 1371: 162). As we said, the Sassanid soci-ety was built on two bases of property and blood (Cristensen, 1378: 228). We stated before Anoshirvan's measures with regard to the mo-nopoly of properties and the goods at the hands of the aristocratic class. Here, we will focus on the other dimension of Sassanid society.i.e. the blood in which only the higher classes that had the pure blood and the orignal race have the right to enjoy pleasure.

The superior class which was known under the concept of Arya was the same Persian superior class, "the concept of Arya meaning the noble and gentle was in address to the high classes-the aristocrats, the clerks and the Persian princes" (Beryan, 1380: 287). This concept denotes its bloody and ethnic meaning, too. Since the Aryan/Persian ethnicity turned into the aristocratic class as the result of ruling over aborigions like the Medes, "(the Persians) used this term for the aboriginals whose territory they occupied and they looked down on them (Gorlits, 1312: 3). Therefore, the term Arya was used both ethnically in contrast to local tribes the native tribes and also it meant original and higher class against the lower classes that were the same under dominating na-tive tribes (the Medes). Thus, the term Arya would have been used to mean both the nobility and the original i.e. class/caste superiority and ethnic/racial, that is, the superiority of the Persian clan which has also led to class and caste superiority. Cristensen has rightly pointed out that Manted to use the wild instincts of the populace to destroy the purity of the race of the nobility, and he considered the purity of race and family bonding as the basis of the superiority of the Aryan nobilities (Christensen, 1907, 82). Here, Christensen denoted by the "the purity of race of the Aryan aristocracy" as in line with both ethnic and aristo-cratic meaning that this super race should not have relationship or marry to the low people. The Persians superior ethnicity/class has controlled the monopoly of desire and pleasure and it justified its political domi-nation with the divine rights of the kings and through prescribing the pills of the heavenly /class Paradise to the subordinated the Mede/Mazdak ethnicity. Indeed, the religion and morality constraints were the tool of the supreme Persian class / society and the government was its military / political tool to monopolize the Medes' property, women. The Median/Mithraist movement of Mazdak with the princi-ples of contract/paradise was a reaction against both of its political and cultural domination. A firm border separates the nobility from the populace in Tansar's letter (Christensen, 1378: 228). The nobles and the aristocrats were among the predominantly Persian ethnic group and the populace were from the Medes and.... The emphasis of Tansar 's letter on the preservation of class distinctions was a reaction against Mazdak 's ideas (Yarshater, the same: 228). Tansar played the role of today's ideologues for the Sassan-ian machine, and the Tansar's reaction is observed in writing the ideol-ogy of the Sassanids/Zoroastrians in Tansar's letter which was com-posed as the political / military action of Anoshirvan against Mazda-kian. It is the reaction of Iranian/Persian political wisdom against the Median/Mazdakids quest for identity of which both reli-gious/Zoroastrian ideology of Tansar the priest's letter and the political and military practices of Anoshirvan were at the service of the interests of the ruling Persian class, and were respectively as the hegemonic and political domination of the Persian ethnic group over the Medes.

The reforms of Anoshirvan prohibited the sex equality and freedom of class marriage and he determined strict rules in which marriage with persons from upper classes was abolished; he negated the equal rights in the use of pleasure and joy, and he constrained the right to use women beyond ordinary marriage to the monopoly of upper classes. Disregard-ing the consent of the woman, aristocrats had the right to use the wom-en of the lower classes as slaves. The public and the majority of the people were deprived of the right to enjoy and freedom of choice. They gave the girls only to the men who were at the same status as them-selves (Yarshater, the same: 216). He re - established the kind of mar-riage called Chakari and Stori and restored many ancient traditions (the same: 217). Anoshirvan revived the Aryan aristocracy with strict reli-gious and cultural norms against the reform of Mazdak by reforming the Family Code .

زن و زاده و باغ آراسته بزرگان شدند ایمن از خواسته

Vandidad that was codified during Sassanian period preached family marriage, austerity and piety, and making water, fire, cow, rejection of life and anti-women culture ... (Razi, 1385: 84). The austerity and piety and anti-womenness in Vandidad is against the principle of pleasure and desire of Mazdak, and the holiness of cow and fire is in contrast to the principle of darkness of Mazdak and Mithra's cow-killing which we will pay attention to in the following.

With the infusion of mysticism and morality into the community, Zo-roastrianism Mages were trying to eradicate the roots of Mith-ra/paradise. Mazdak tried to realize Paradise and sexual freedom in this same world, but the Sassanians confiscated paradise through negating earthly paradise of Mazdak. They took paradise to the other world that not all but those obeying the Persians kings had the right to enter the heavenly paradise into the celestial while everyone in the world had the right to use the paradise with pleasure and freedom and drunken-ness and without suppressing instincts and obeying the power owners in Mazdak's Mithraist ritual .

The religious struggles of Anoshirvan against Mazdak: Zoroaster against Mithra

In previous materials, we sporadically refered to cases such as the re-production of Mithra (contract/paradise) in the actions and ideas of Mazdak; now we will present Mazdak's bonds with Mitra, the social ritual of the Medes in a more complete form. Prior to the examination of the Mazdak's ideas, we must respond to the doubts raised over relat-ing Mazdak to Manism and Mazdayasna. In contrast to some research-ers who consider Mazdakism as some reforms in Zoroasterism (Yar-shatr, 1983: 995), Mazdak was neither a priest nor an Avestan inter-preter that Zoroastrians regarded him as an atheist (Klima, 1371: 166). Mazdak told Ghobad you must annihilate the fire temples (Masoodi quoting from Khosrawi, 1359: 31). The basis of the Zoroastrian reli-gion is founded on fire temple and fire in which fire stands for Asha. The fire is the holiest symbol of the zoroastrian religion. Mazdak who called for the annihilation of fire temples could not be Zoroastrianism himself. Unlike MazdaYasna religion, he (Mazdak) also knows the separation of light from darkness not as the result of awareness but due to the misstep and incident. Mazdakism runs counter to the ritual of MazdaYasna and Zoroastrianism in which he defines the triumph of light on the darkness through knowledge and will. Further, stigmatizing Mazdak as Manavism was more for his destruction and the legiti-macy of his removal.



“He was an atheist Manavi under arrest, how could a Manavi person (Mazdak) attract Shah’s attention?” (Shipman, 1383: 53). If Mazdak was Manavi with regard to the hate and antipathy that the Maz-daYasnan community in relation to Mani and his teachings, how a Ma-navi was able to penetrate the cleric system in the era of Ghobad (ZarinKoo, 1368: 476). Relating Mazdak to Manavians has been more for accursing or detesting them by priests (the sam: 479). Manavism is based on the contradiction of the spirit with the body, the preference of spirituality over the body, and the suppression of bodily instincts in which calling Mazdak as Manavist was not baseless with the explanations given about the value of pleasure and desires regarding Mazdak.

Given the lack of resources on Mazdak’s ideas and the destruction of Mazdakism works, it would not be easy to understand Mazdak well and any theory would not go beyond the mere hypothesis, i.e. unprov-en hypothesis. The least amount of information left is from beside Shahristani in the Book Al-melal and Anahal which is derived from oral narrations fitting the narrator's mind. The possibilities of the old thought were not able to understand Mazdak’s ideas which were not habitual to the old world. Therefore, the core of his ideas is still pre-served given that it is the only source of his ideas.

In Mazdak’s opinion: "The actions of light are intentional and with liberty, but the actions of darkness are boner and incidental" (shahristani in Klima, 1371: 38). In terms of Mazdak, the principle is envious and it is the source of effect incidentally not willingly (Zarinkob, 1368: 480). Mazdakids: the salvation day is the time of the victory of the inferiorated and justiceseeking masses and this freedom is through the chance and incident. The term 'Khebt ' means hitting, blindly hitting and blindly acting like the foot- beating of the blind camel on the earth, meaning attack, revolt and rage. Contract (Itfagh) also means agreement, useful and capricious (Klima, the same: 39). Despite the views of some researchers that have wrongly considered Mazdak as the supporter of the light principle and hence MazdaYasna, he is the supporter of the darkness principle that he knows the occurrence of darkness actions as based on gaffe and incident. Since Mazdak is the fan of the inferiorized people and he considers their salvation in the way of boner and incident and he knows the happening of the actions of darkness through the way of gaffe and incident, too. Thus, Mazdak is the supporter of the darkness actions that he regards their victory as based on the mistake and incident. This point that the ancient thought did not have the power to digest and analyse Mazdak’s ideas denotes that it is not understandable to follow the ideas of a social reformer in supporting the notion of darkness and according to their interpretation, they have considered Mazdak as the supporter of the light followers. That is, they have expressed Mazdak’s opinions within the framework of the Muslim ideology, and "there are little words regarding the darkness which is completely an independent principle, and the brightness which is an Izadi (divine) principle has become significant" (Yarshater, the same, 232). Even if Mazdak is the fan of light – that

he is not- he sees the separation of the light from the darkness as based on knowledge not ignorance as opposed to Mazdayasna religion.

Mazdak considered himself and the despised masses as the advocates of the principle of darkness as against religion of the Sassanid dynasty, who supported the principle of light and fire. In confirming this statement, we can also refer to his request of Ghobad regarding the destruction of fire temples (Masoodi quoting from Khosrawi, 1359: 31) since the gaffe, darkness and the destruction of the fire temple are the principles of the Mithraism.

Mazdak was the reviver of the Medes religion. Vandidad, whose origin is related to the Achaemenid period, was codified in the Sassanian period (Razi, 1385: 131), Vandidad introduces Mazdak as Ishmogh the ill-behaved, impure heathen and the death demons (Vandida, Fargard 4, article 49). As we indicated before, all the Daves of Vandidad are in address to the Medes and Mithraism. In the continuation of the evil calling of Mithra, Vandidad called Mazdak as the devil, Ishmogh and heathen as well. As the Sassanians were the continuation of the Achaemenid dynasty, Mazdakids were also the reproduction of Mithraism ritual of the Medes. The Iranians and their Zoroastrianism have used these nicknames of dave and evil merely in address to the Medes/Kurds.

Moreover, Ibn-e Nadim's narration about Mazdakids describing them as the found children is not unrelated to other myths about Kurds coming into the existence in the Iranian and Jewish myths in which one considers them as the found people in the mountains escaping Zahak and the other regards them as found people who had been born out of devils having intercourse with Salomon maids. We stated documentary evidence with regard to Kurd being of Mazdak and Mazdakids- refer to historical commonalities-. We expressed this point- go to the section about Mithra- that Mithra is the advocate of darkness principle and their ceremonies were held in the caves away from the light of the sun. Mazdak's struggle with Anoshirvan is the reproduction of the old pattern of Mithra/devil's struggle with Ahormazd. The first action that Mithra did after the emergence was the hunt of the bright sun and the killing of the sacred cow that was the greatest creation of Ahormazd; hence, Mithra was known as Devil in the religious culture of Zoroaster defending the principle of the earth against the sky, the body against the soul and the instinct against the reason. Therefore, the earth, body, and instinct are the symbols of darkness and evil in heavenly religions and metaphysical philosophy – go to the section about Mithra-. Mazdak presents the principle of the darkness against the principle of the aristocracy and the Sassanids imperial power in order to complete their practical struggle against them whose victory is a symbol of the victory of the people on the Iranian aristocracy based on gaffe and incidents. Contract – as Klima says- means the agreement that is the reproduction of Mithra/contract and we are returning to it below.

Further, according to Shahrastani, Khoramdinan, who were the continuation of Mazdakian, were denying resurrection day, reward and the punishment of the other world and they saw the reward and punishment in this same world (Shahrastani quoting from Yarshatir, the same: 229). If we look over the previous materials- the chapter about Mithra-, we will see that the emphasis

is on this same world and the denial of the soul and the hereafter. Is the reproduction of Mithra's ritual while the foundation of Zoroastrianism is based on the hereafter, reward and punishment. Basically, Zoroaster developed the concepts of the hell and heaven in contradiction to the earthly evil of the Median Mithra-ists and then these concepts penetrated into the other heavenly religions; further, Devil is the illustration of Mithra that found its way into other religions.

#### Anoshirvan's Zoroastrianism against Mazdak's Mithraism:

The age of Sasanids/ Anoshirvan is the age of formulation of Iranian political reason and the collection and writing of the myths and Zoroastrianism. It was in this period that the entire oral mythology were compiled and after the suppression of the Mazdak's revolt, they codified and wrote the Iranian political reason (divine right of kings and religious culture) being developed with Cyrus / Zoroaster and established with Darius / Mages.

As we stated before, all the decency of Anoshirvan was because of suppressing Mazdak and his uprising –as Noldeke says. Khosraw's reforms resulted in the removal of the traces of Mazdak's movement (Zarinkoob, 1368: 499). "The suppression of Mazdakids promoted the status of Zoroaster religion and the class of the clerics in an extraordinary way; although this flourishing had started before, the Zoroaster religion raised up to the apex along with Khosraw Anoshirvan" (Zarinkoob, 1368:484 -485). In the time of Mazdakids, Zoroastrian religion has not yet decisively prevailed and it was the Mazdakids rebellions that produced the final version of the Avesta and the triumph of the government religious community " (Widingern, 1377: 425). There were several stages for the collection and the recognition of Zoroaster during the Sassanian period, the most important of which was the victory against Mazdakids.

"Kertir established Zoroastrianism against the other religions; Shahpor the second against Christians and Khosraw the first –Anoshirvan- composed the sacred texts of Avesta in against Mazdakids" (the same: 354). " Although MazdaYasna religion had formalized from the time of Kertir and Ardashir, it was from the era of Anoshirvan that MazdaYasna religion became national all over Iran without opposition" (Zarinkob, the same: 485). Therefore, "the final step of writing scripture realized in the time of Khosraw the first in against the dangerous movement of Mazdakids, it was the victory of the Iranian religion which we call the Zoroastrianism right belief" (Widingern, 1377: 358) that. This point that it was necessary to use the memories of the priests to codify Avesta at the time of Anoshirvan shows that all the adorations and the principles of Zoroastrianism were not collected in the prior eras –the times of Shapour, Ardashir and Belash (Zarinkob, the same: 486). Thus, as the basis of the Zoroastrianism was emerged and developed in contrast to Median Mithraism- refer to the chapter on Zoroaster-, the final codification and establishment of Zoroastrianism and Iranian myths in the form of KhodaiName was formulated in against to the remains of Mithraist/Median religion in Mazdak's movement. Iran carries out meaning in contradiction to Aniran and as we stated before, the Aniran of the Iranian were the same Medes both from the viewpoint of religion and politics.

The origin of Vandidad was related to Achamanids era, but its final codification is related to Sasanids era after the defeat of Mazdak movement. Vandidad talks about the impure Mazdak in the continuation of calling the Medes/ Kurds as Daves. It speaks of those who fight with Istivzat, the demon of the death, that is, Mazdak the impure atheist who entrusted people to the hunger and death (Fargard 4, part 49 quoting from Cristensen, the same: 31). They are talking about the oppositions of the religion and the most atheist heathen called Mazdak (the same: 32). Vandidad book was finally codified knowingly against Kurd's Mazdakian movement and as Bois said it was the most important book of the Zoroastrians up to the 19th century, this book in line with other texts of Zoroastrian abstracted Mazdak as the sign of impurity and Anoshirvan as the symbol of the purity and light. Khosraw addressing Mazdak in Shahname:s

...شود دین زردشت بر کاستی      گر ایدونک او را بود راستی

...همیکار بد را به بد نشمري همه مردمان را به دوزخ بري

...مباد اندرین نامور بارگاه      همی دارد او دین یزدان تباه

Mazdak's movement did not merely lead to the political fixation of the religion of Zoroaster, but it gave it an ideological function and organized and stuck together all the system of the society. Against sexual freedom and pleasure in Mazdak's movement, the Mages changed the tradition domain into religious one and they interfered in the most private domains of the individual and prevented any freedom through the meddling of the religion in all aspects of life even in all constituencies. Through the dominancy of the totality of religion in society, they prevented the freedom of instinct and personal life of the people. "The priests association gave customary affairs a sacred and religious aspect by interfering in these issues and they had the right to engage in all human affairs" (Kristensen, 1378: 83). The saints interfered in all affairs including the creeds related to the marriage, ablution, burial and ... (the same: 85). Due to the suppression of the movement remains, the relationship of knowledge and power reached its ultimate point in the Sassanian period; knowledge in the service of power penetrated the most hidden domains of the individuals, and by suppressing the lives of the persons, it became a tool in the service of religion and the power of the state machines. "The Zoroastrian religion was involved in the smallest incidents, and every individual would become guilty of a little neglect of sin and vice throughout the day" (the same: 85). The priests went to the villages to carry out religious assignments ... and the farmers of each village had to provide the clergy with the necessary materials (same, 86). After the inclination of the people to the Mazdak movement, they lost the control of their personal lives, and the clergies were obliged to lead the people and to edify their souls. "The priests were both in charged of conducting the religious ceremonies as well as spiritual guidance and the edification of the people souls" (the same: 86). In the end, to prevent the Mazdakism uprising again and to suppress their works by using the Zoroaster religion, the Sassanians gained access to the private domain of individuals and suppressed their instincts, and prevented the freedom of their personal mentality via dominating the religious/jurisprudence totality. This was all that was founded against the Mazdak movement in defending the individual liberty.

- Civil condition versus the natural state: Mithra/Contract versus the divine sovereignty of kings

John Locke knows all the princes and rulers of independent states as in the natural states and he defines the governments that are merely based upon the consent and interests of their serfs. He says it is only the collective and interactive agreement of the people to form a society and a political unit that can put an end to the natural state. The only condition for the civil state is the desire and satisfaction for membership in the political community (Jones, 220 - 221). The history of Iran before the period of constitution, and even after that to date was the history of despotic and the dominance of the ruling class / class and its justification. The relation of the King to the people was that of the master/slave relationship and the God/servant in which the King was elected neither through the consent of the people but on behalf of God. The Iranian empire is the carrier of the interests of the ruling Persian ethnicity/class on the basis of domination and power over the Medes. Cyrus considered herself as the elect from beside the Mardok to justify the legitimacy of her actions. King Darius, too, considered himself as elected by AhourMazds: "The Great God AhourMazd ... who made Darius the King ... Darius the King says since Ahourmazd saw this land as disturbed, he bestowed it to me ... whatsoever I told them, they did it as I wished ... whatsoever I did, I did it in the request of AhorMazd". Daruis is repeating frequently: "People did whatsoever I desired" and my volition is the wanting of Ahormazd. Therefore, if we examine the inscriptions of all other kings during the Achaemenid empire, we do not encounter the importance of the people or condition of their consent. The King, as the representative of Ahormazd, knows his verdicts as the God or divine laws which all must obey. The opponents of the royal order were introduced as evil and liars and they had to be suppressed. "The Achaemenid kings, in their own names, did not use their swords so far from their lands, but on the way to enforce divine commandments, the king's deeds are approved and prescribed by the Great God. This indicates the absolute subordination of the people (Girishmen, 1388: 172). The legitimacy of kings was not the result of the satisfaction and acceptance of the people, but the special relation of the king with the gods and his own lineage (Wishofer, 48). Like their descendants of the Sassanid dynasty, Ashkanids kings claimed that their power was not based on good intention of their serfs but it was the gift of God ... in Iran, as elsewhere in the Middle East, power was regarded as a divine gift. God appointed the prophets and the kings, and the agreement of the people had no roles in both cases (Yarshater, Cambridge, 34). The absolute despotism of theocracy dominated Iran under the Sassanian rule; it was at this stage that the sanctifying the kings crossed the boundaries of the monarchy. The kings are not only the elect of God for the monarchy, but the God himself or from Gods' lineage (Moradi, 1389: 431). 'In HajiAbad inscription, Shapour the first called himself as Shapour the god, the king of the kings of Iran and his race as from the Istif's gods. Khosraw the first states his characteristics as follows: Bagh, nice, soothing, grat and the best, noble, Khosraw, the king of the kings, fortunate, pious, benefactor, the one who has received great prosperity and extended ruling from beside the God, co-effigy of the gods, ...." (Christensen, quoting from Moradi, the same: 70). The divine aspect of the Sassanid dynasty

hs clearly been mentioned in the inscriptions (Widdingern, 1377:431). Shahname has expressed Anoshirvan's metaphysical legitimacy in speech related to the king of Anoshirvan:

بدارید و از ما مدارید باک      شما دل به فرمان یزدان پاک جهاندار  
و پیروز و فرمانروا که اویست بر پادشاه پادشاهافروزنده  
...نماینده ما را سوي داد راه تاج و خورشید و ماه  
به چیزی که پیمان دهد آن کنید      شما رای و فرمان یزدان کنید  
...تورا بر پرستش بود یارمند      نگهدار تاج است و تخت بلند

Therefore, the institution of government in the history of Iran is not based on the consent and agreement of the people, but it is the dicta-torship and the divine right of kings. It is what the theory of satisfac-tion and people 's consent was developed in contrast to. But how was Mazdak? Did he know the liberation from the chaos and injustice merely as the result of king's will and through Farah Izadi (gods majes-ty) like the Iranians or as the result of the will of the people? Is there some narration related to the divine legitimacy of Mazdak ordained to the gods?

As opposed to the Iranian kings, Mazdak's aim was not to preserve the cosmic order and the fulfillment of the divine will. It was the salvation of the people, which, like the actions of darkness, he saw them through the gaffe and incident. As Klima has rightly understood, the Itefagh (incident) means adjustment and agreement (Klima, 1371 :39). Thus, the freedom of the people and political order is actualized through so-ciety and social contract. We have also mentioned – in the chapter re-lated to Mithra –which, contrary to the theories of Komon and Varmazin, Mia and Paul Thema rightly proved that the origin of Mithra does not mean the sun worshipping, but the treaty and social contract. As Mithra and the Medes in selecting Diako to be the King, Mazdak sees the way of salvation as based on the social contract and the agreement in opposition to the principle of the light based on the hier-archical order and the divine rights of kings. His revolutionary tantrum is founded on consent and the contract between the individuals just to destroy –minimize- the Sassanian hierarchical order and to rebuild – collect - the society. As we have noted earlier, Mazdak considered the will and volition of individuals as the principle and precedent to the totality of the society. Therefore, it is possible to risk presenting a hy-pothesis that Mazdak is the reproduction of the Mithraist/Median soci-ety that does not believe in any pre - defined principles and he knows the principle of forming a society and the political entity as based on the satisfaction and social contract. The idea of "adaptation" meaning contract is compatible with the other ideas of Mazdak. He called for rejection of the sovereignty and fulfillment of equality, and the agree-ment and contract will be reached in terms of equality of people. With-in the framework of hierarchical and class order, not

agreement and agreement, but the union and obedience are the principle conditions. We will try to verify this hypothesis by examining Mazdak thoughts. The realization of paradise and desired and equal political order is possible only through the agreement and the will of the people in this world, that is, people are the creators of heaven / paradise and political order. Nevertheless, in the Zoroastrian/Pers culture, the Creator went to heaven, and the Paradise was transformed into Ferdos, and the political order is not created by the people but it is the continuation of the cosmic order of Ahura Mazda and the creature of both Gods (Ahura/King).

The reason why he describes this actions as gaffe and blind is because the process of the Sasanian society and old political sense was going on in contrary to the ideas of Mazdak so as to present salvation as a gradual and reforming process. To realize the contract and his own desired society, he considered the revolutionary insurgency and uncontrollable wills – according to Cristensen - as its agent. The blind wills and the revolution are merely for the distortion of the old order, and the contract and agreement are for the arrangement of the new Mith-rism order based on the equality of property and the pleasure for all the people. This right of equity is not formed except through consent and agreement between all members. Agreement and social contract would not be possible but via the negation of the authority. Ibn-e Nadim knows one of the main principles of Mazdak as the negation of the hegemony and the friendly behavior along with equality among the individuals (quoting from Cristensen, the same: 49).

From the viewpoint of Mazdak, the dominance is the major factor of unequal distribution of women and wanting, and to achieve the main purpose of sharing in demand and women, we must first reject hegemony. Thus, equality of all in demand and women requires equality of all in the political power and the fight against tyranny in every form of it. The negation of the domination does not have any legitimacy in the framework of the discipline of domination; hence, to reject the hegemony, we must inevitably rule out the existing order and to deny the current sovereignty, we must revolt that is based on incident and gaffe. Then, we must carry out the revolution and subtract the old order and settle the new order through contract and treaty and to assure the triumph of darkness on the light. Therefore, the main struggle of Mazdak was not communism or sexual equality, but it was the struggle with political domination; hence, the foundation of his struggle was political, and then social/economical or religious. Mazdak waged violence and fighting because he knew the negation of the existing hegemony as the prerequisite for the realization of equality, justice and the contract. The main domination was on the side of the Persian ethnic group or the Persians mono-ethnic empire against the Kurd/Mede in which the ethnic domination itself had led to ethnic and religious domination. Therefore, the rejection of the ethnic and governmental sovereignty required the breakage of the caste and religious dominance and the establishment of equality. Within the framework of the existing discipline, neither communism nor justice, nor equality, nor sexual freedom was possible, and the way to actualize justice and equality (both economic and gender) was ruling out the present political / ethnic domination.

Of course, the Mazdakism revolution did not mean the prevalence of violence and bloodshed. Both Ibn-e Nadim and Maghdasi considered the rejection of bloodshed, the tolerance of other religious views and the kindness and good behavior with people as among the fundamental principles of Mazdakids (quoting from Yarshater, the same: 228 – 231). However, in contrast to existing order that has become so violent that it defends itself very harshly, there is no remedy except using violence. Law, religion and the ruling order were nothing but the ways to internalize the violence of the Persian ethnic group; therefore, there remained no remedy except practicing violence against the rejection of the ruling violence. Yarshater has noticed the Mazdakids conflict which, from one side, forbade the bloodshed, and from the other side, they resorted to revolutionary violence, but having been unable to comprehend it, he has gone astray in analyzing the reasons behind it and he has compared it with the Safavids: "The change in a moral and peace - based religious doctrine, which aims at the salvation of the soul, into a warlike and insurgent ritual, should not be a wonder; the other example of that is the events related to the Safavids dynasty, who were the followers of mysticism in the beginning, but they turned into bolder warriors in the fifteenth century as the conditions required it (Yarshater, the same: 223). There are two sordid mishaps in the explanation and the analysis of Yarshater. From one side, he sees the aim of the peaceful school of Mazdakids as the salvation of the soul, and from the other side, he compares Mazdakids with Safavids which we will criticize the second case later on in the following. But as to the fact that he regards the aim of Mazdakids as the salvation of the soul, it is utterly opposed to social deeds and the doctrines of Mazdakids and Khoramdinan. If their purpose was the salvation for soul and spirit, they would doubtlessly have faith in the virtue and the immortality of the soul, as the spirit and soul are related to the heavenly world while Mazdakids, as Yarshater himself pointed out, were denying the resurrection, the virtue, and the punishment in the other world. Mazdakids' aim of the peace was the peace in this same world, as Ibn Nadim pointed out, they sought the virtue and punishment in this same world, and it is the belief in the virtue and the punishment of this world that has inevitably led them towards the combat. If the purpose was the tranquility of the spirit and soul, it would certainly not be possible within this worldly possibilities since the virtue is in leaving aside the world and taking refuge in the illusion of the gods and the Hereafter. But the philosophy of Mazdakids in seeking pleasure and common justice clearly shows their peace and serenity as in this world and through the body. Since peace and temporal/earthly serenity need secular facilities, and secular resources were exclusively in the service of the aristocrat and the clergies, there must be some kinds of revelation and violence from part of the Mazdakids to acquire your own rights and to return the stolen properties and women by the nobles.

The twelve forces Mazdak named state this principle indirectly: "want-er", "giver" and "taker". It all indicates that, first of all, you must require or ask for your right. You must ask for and demand your right with peace. Every human being has some rights that must ask for them and he must not leave away his own desires and instincts. After wanting the rights, it is the duty of the rulers or the powerfuls to pay the rights of the people (giver). In the face of refusal to give the people their rights, we come to the third principle, "taker" where people have to take their rights and not ignore their own rights. In case of its refusal, the taker is allowed to use any



sorts of means. Everything is permissible except conniving the rights. The concept of taker is very important in the thought of Mazdak. As we have noted before, in contrary to the old thoughts, Mazdak is not addressing the powerful people and oppressors, the oppressed people and the populace. If he was addressing the oppressors like the prophets and other reformers of history, he would merely express the concept of “the giver”, while the concept of “the taker” is used only when the people themselves demand their own rights. They must not look forward to see the grace of their rulers and the reward in the other world. After the realization of the first three basic principles and the grip of the people's rights, other tenets of Mazdak would convey meaning such as: “the grower”, “the owner”, “the consumer (eater)”, “the riser”, “the generator”, “the killer”, “the comer” and “the becomer” which all carry out meaning only after the main principle of “the taker” and after getting the rights, and they are all related to life, consumption, marriage, ... and ultimately death or the end of the lives facilities. However, if there “the taker” does not come into being, the rest of the principles, i.e. life, consumption, marriage and ... will be meaningless and finally the death comes to us. The death will have no meaning since the reward and punishment only convey meaning in this same world. In Mazdak's philosophy, securing the rights is the most important principle of life and the foundation of other rights. Since there is no faith in life after death, and the reward, punishment, pleasure, and a paradise is in this same world. To justify the tragedy of death, they resorted neither like mystics to the vacant corners, nor like the philosophers to utopia and no more like the religions to the hereafter paradise, but they welcomed the tragedy of death by the Dionysus dance (Kurdish Halparke), and they believed in the enjoyment of this world and the fulfillment of the earthly paradise.

The requirement to realize the earthly heaven or Mithra/paradise is the rejection of the political domination, i.e. Mithra/contract. They considered the answer to the tragedy of death with the opportunity to enjoy the pleasure of life and freedom and equality in this world, because they did not believe in God and another world beyond this terrestrial world. Therefore, achieving your rights is allowed in any way and the way to secure the rights is the combat and the rejection of the domination. The principle of domination was political / ethnic at first, then it took a class and ritual aspect; thus, the priority is fighting political and ethnic domination, whether through violence or without violence. Establishing your right is the foundation of life; there will be no life without having the rights and facilities. The right taken through force and violence is not restored except via force and violence.

The last principle of Mazdak is permanency which something like the philosophy of life and the meaning of life remaining even after death. It is the same value of the self-expression hidden in political action that will lead to the true survival, it is like the thought that Hannah Arendt presented concerning political action in response to the death crisis. The “permanency maker” principle, which is the last principle, is after the meaning of life. There is no meaning and philosophy in life without other principles especially ‘the taker’ which means taking the right. Without securing the right, seeking out the meaning of life will be nothing more illusions and melancholy. The first principle is “taking” in which you have to call for your own right. The second principle is ‘the giver’ in which you should give the opportunity to the other who has trampled on your right. First, you have to seek the political right and reject the domination,

after which the life will convey meaning. With-out political /practical struggle and taking the right, it would be mean-ingless to search the meaning of life.

Mazdak knows the actualization of the rights as the fundamental right to life, even at the price of life so that he and his supporters sacrificed their life to achieve their fundamental rights. The value of self-expression precedes the value of survival. For Mazdak does not know the slavelike and without any right survival as the real survival, and he knows the true survival as the struggle in the way of gaining the right and the recognition of oneself. Therefore, the principle of self-expression and capturing the right has the priority even over the right to life and survival. There will be no way to self-expresion and grisping the right except by the refusal of the domination of the other and the practical struggle.

On the other hand, Yarshater is comparing Mazdakids with Safavids, which is a comparison of incommensurables. As mysticism is rooted in the absolute truth, it has the talent or prerequisite to utilize sword for the realization of the truth and it has always applied power in the service of its mystical truth in which the truth has finally changed into the isdeology of power taken from Zoroaster to Isfandiyar, Safavids and today. However, Mazdakids did not regard the truth as a super-human right so as to sacrifice human for the sake of it, but they see it as the physical / terrestrial right and a human right that precedes all other laws. The right of man is the same physical right desiring the property and women, not divine and religion right to sacrifice man at the feet of general concepts similar to Isfandiyar and Safavids. The right of Mazdak is the right to the liberty itself, not a right to prevent the liberty. Truth is not superior to freedom or against freedom, but the truth is the same liberty and the struggle for freedom is the principle of liberty. Freedom is nothing beyond the struggle, there is nothing be-yond the fight for liberty, the struggle for freedom itself is the liberty. Freedom is the truth and the life.

#### The contemplation in the ideas of Mazdak

Contemplating in the ideas of Mazdak shows the reproduction of Mithra's ritual in it; but there are some traces in the Mazdak's ideas that are not Mithraist/Median, but they are in contradiction to it and they are the result of the influence Mazdayasna ideas in Mazdak viewpoints. Mazdakism movement is of great importance in the history of the Kurd, it is the starting point of the separation of the theory from practice in the Kurdish history. If the talk of darkness, mistake, pleas-ure, and happy life is still the continuation of Mithraism, there are con-concepts such as duality, the Sovereign God, and ... have nothing to do with the logic of Mazdak's practices. Besides, its ethnic form has been devoted to its content even though the social actions of Mazdak – as in the words of Ilthaim and Vishofer- was in continuation of social action of Gaumates. Nonetheless, he did not highlight its ethnic /Median as-pect similar to Gaumates. This indicates the influence of Iranian culture in logic of the Kurd. We see the logical result of this impact even to-day in the culture of Kurdistan. The logic of Kurd action

is tragic and s/he is the wo/man of combat, but the culture dominating it is mysticism and submission. The secret of all the struggles of the Kurds and at the same time their surrender exceeding the service and betrayal of the individuals refers back to this conflict between the theory and practice. From one side, being the Kurd has sedimented in the structure of our existence, and in the other side, our knowledge has come under the occupation of Iranian culture. In practice, the Kurdish campaigns and revolutions are continuing, but the culture and theory combatable with it is absent. From the Medes period up to Gaumates and Ferawartish time, the theory and practice of the Kurds were identical. The Ajdihak's culture was consistent with his social conduct. In the other words, their theory and practice were the same. This period continues until Mazdak's uprising which speaks clearly from pleasure, shared society, the destruction of the fire temple and the ethnic distinctions. However, the same period is the end of the beginning of Kurdism and the end of the beginning of the unity in the theory and practice in which there has penetrated some streaks of metaphysical / religious thought into it. In particular, we can hardly find some words talking about its ethnocism aspect, or there might have existed, but we are not aware of them due to destroying its resources. Perhaps Mazdak, like Gaumates, wished to reveal his Mede and anti-Pers being after the fixation of power; however, he never came to the consolidation of power so that we could know his secrets. Nevertheless, a paradox occurred in the Kurdish insurgency after Mazdak in the Middle Ages in which the ethnocist nature of the riots was forgotten at the theoretical level of them, and there can only be observed the scattered elements of the Kurdism without the spirit of the ethnocism. On the contrary to the contemporary time in which the ethnocism spirit has been revived with modern nationalism, some of its components like democracy, sex equality, Dionysian spirit, earthly/contract legitimacy and ... have been forgotten.

Thus, contemporary Kurdish movements have acquiesced the leadership of traditional Mystics and Sheikhs. For the real revival of the Kurd's history, modern nationalism, which is without content, must converge the pre - modern Kurdish nationalism that is full of content but without shape. Content-less form of the modern nationalism and the form-less Kurdish content of Kurand of the Middle Ages (Islamic) must be dissolved in this synthesis, so that the future riots also could have the Kurdish components as well as its form. In the Middle Ages, their ethnic aspects were gone into the abyss of oblivion, and even there were some riots in the contemporary period where the contrast between theory and practice was clearly observed so that these riots were Kurdish in practice not in theory. They were the reproduction of the same Kurdish insurgencies in practice, but in theory, they were in the form of Iran, Islam, mysticism and ... which ultimately resulted in digesting the practice in theory and in the assimilating Kurdish being completely. The advent of modern nationalism saved the form and the appearance of the Kurdish being from annihilation, but it has not still regained the theory and content suitable for Kurdish - specific nationalism. To do so, we must know the history and we must find the phenomenon of the political Kurdish history and the basis of political action of the Kurd in history. To unify the theory and practice, we must understand who we are, and in order to do so we must know who we were that the history tells this to us. The history tells us who we were that the others were not. The study of the history is not the study of the instinctive action common among all nations like the study of the natural behavior of the tribes. The history attends to actions which are the result of thinking and thought. Thus, the study of the Kurdish history is the study of the history of the Kurdish thought. Since this history

is the history conscious actions and history of thought, it will refind its logical manifestation in political action and political insurgency. As the result, we must discover the political history of the Kurd. The sort of a political history which will prepare the foundation of the political action of the Kurdish state. The history that will reach from the Mede and Mithra to Gaumates and Ferawartish and to Mazdak and Khoramdinan and... up to the contemporary uprisings.

Regrettably, the bases of political action have not been restored in the contemporary uprising and the political action of the Kurd has been up in the air and without roots. That's why we don't have a certain expression of political struggle. A group consider Kurds as Iranian, another group as Turks or as Islamic. That is to say, the ethnic/national identity of the Kurd has been forgotten. Besides, a group try to give significance to Kurdish uprisings under the term of Islam and the Quran, another group in the name of Marxism and liberalism, and some group with ethical/ legal not political nationalism, and some addressed the Kurdish rebellions unknowingly through atomizing Kurdish identity under citizenship. All these efforts are equal to meaninglessness and the neutralization of their action out of their Kurdish meaning. We (as Kurds) take refuge in the skirts of one of the ideologies each time through forgetting the original identity of the Kurd with afore-mentioned components. like a beheaded bird. They are unaware that the idea of our salvation lies not in imported ideologies (left, Islamic and west); hence, it is in our own political existence which is illustrated in our history and political action. Kurdism is forgotten with the afore-mentioned components. We have digested ourselves in the universal totality and we have forgotten ourselves with the emphasis on the common practice of the Middle East whether Islamic or Iranian instead of putting the emphasis on the elements of Kurdism such as equality, earthly being, liberation and revolution against the outside world.



## Chapter Six;

### Iran Land (Greater Land), Iranian Government and the Pattern of Iranian Ration

The genealogy of two words Iranwîj and Kurd .

The other concept that we have to address is " Iranwîj " or the same Greater Iran. We should know what it means and whether the concept of Iran land and its ultra-national concept now derives from it and if includes all nations living in the present - day Iranian plateau or whether it has had another meaning that today's modern ideologists have in-jected another meaning into it?

Iranwîj is a religious concept in MazdaYasna religion . The Plateau that called the Greater Iran today has not only been known as Iran but that mainly the Persians has not entered the Iranian plateau and they were resident in the steppes of southern Russia. The inhabitants of this land before the Persians entered it and before the formation of the concept of the Greater Iran were the Medes and local Kurds which were named Iran after the Iranian migration and its conquest . In this sense, it was the lost Paradise of Persians was that the Persians / Parthians were its carriers; wherever the Persians occupied, they molded their religion on it called the conquered territory as Iran (Persia). Of course, since it was originally a religion-based concept, they called the places where famous fire temples were set up as Iran. With their absolute sovereignty of Zoroastrianism on politics in Sassanids era in which the Persian political wisdom was codified based on the Zoroastrian ideology, this concept took the landly/ political shape and they called the whole conquered lands as Iranwîj. (reffer to the images to see the maps of the Medes).

### Greater Iran

The concept of Greater Iran or " Iranwîj " did not have the meaning that today derives from it does as a land composed of several clans absorbed the common identity of Iranian and defining Iran identity beyond the ethnicity, since when basically the concept of Iranwîj was created, the Iranians had not migrated to the lands called Iran and they had not become acquainted with ethnic groups inhabiting the plateau later on called Iran. "We should not refer to either the words "Aryan" or "Iranwîj" to the Iranian people or to the people living in ancient Iran, as Noldeke says, we should not connect Aryana as the general term to describe all

Iranians from the East to the West, because Strabon describes Aryana as in East of Iran " (Newly, 1381: 185). There is no evidence that the name of Iran has been applied to the whole Achaemenid Empire in classical or Hebrew resources, if Iran was the official name of the State of the Medes or Persians, we would no doubt see it in the old texts" (Cassel, 1886, 1-3).

Iranwich has never meant the present Iran and its nations, but it has been a fictional, dreamlike concept or a "religious concept" in Mazdaism (Gnoli, 1993). Newly regarded the evidence present in the Assyrian and Achaemenids texts about the name of Arya as well as the Herodotus indications and the classic authors neither or probably religious, nor political or he would not see the evidence that Zoroaster would have considered the term Arya signifying nationality (Gnoli, 1989, 32). In the Arya/ Avesta texts, the term Arya is used to describe the lands or peoples of Arya or Khorna or their God-bequeathed bounty, it would distinguish the land and the people that are Zoroastrian from those who are not (Shahbazi, Kertis, 1391: 153). Therefore, the term Arya is essentially religion-based (Gnoli, *ibid*, 68). They called all the lands that they occupied under the name of the Zoroastrian Jihad as God-given Land, they owned and called them as Iranwich. In words of Newly, the term Iran was formed when religious scholars took over the given Arya, and they directed that area to Zoroastrianism and Avestan Aryas had not been the state political organization (*ibid*, 68).

This concept of the Lost Paradise which reflected all the pretty past years of Aryan life, was naturally regarded as the birth place of Zoroaster (Zarinkob, 1368: 32). It was a religious concept and a mythological place in Mazdaism religion and as Hertsfield has pointed out, it meant Agran, i.e. the land of the fire temples where the religion of Mazdaism/Zoroastrianism ruled and the fire temples established there; hence, Iran has been a religious concept referring to the places where Mazdaism religion had dominated and the fire places had been constructed. Due to the birth of Zoroaster in 600 BC, it is probable that the lifespan of this concept may be traced back to the conflict of Persians and Medes but later they assumed this concept as sacred and they took it to the distant pasts so as to call all the way of their migration under such a concept.

Iranwich is the same Airan Wajra in Avesta, that is, the land of the Aryan region, where it has been a mythical land and they have wanted to assume it as a special region ... first Khorezm - Vandidad- later it became Azerbaijan district (Christensen, 1343: 84). The Samian/Arabian Babylon was also called the heart of the Greater Iran during the Sassanid dynasty, with a change in the position of the Great fire temples, the location of the Greater Iran changed, too. Initially. It was first a land in southern Russia, then while migrating to the Khorezm region, they called Khorem as Iranwich because it has been the route of the Aryans' entry to Iran. Maraquradt, Nieberg, Benonist and Henning have said that Iranwich is Khorezm (Gimen, 1378: 11). Most of the lands of Iranwich (Ayeram weija) such as Gova, Merv, Balkh, Nisayaya, Herwaiva (Herat) and ... are located outside the current Iranian borders in the direction of the east and northeastern north (Grant in Curtis, 1390: 47) . Newly and Witzel know it as the centre of Afghanistan (Grant in Curtis, the same: 53), that is, the way of the Persians migration.

Therefore, "Iranwich " has been a kind of changable living environment where Iranian Aryans were migrating all over there (Zarinkob, 1368: 68). They called the place where they have taken and inhabited as Iranwich. Once it was Khorezm, a time Azerbaijan and a period Babel, perhaps if the path of Iranian migration had been anywhere else on the planet, there had been called as greater Iran today on the earth planet. Along with the Sassanian ruling in which Zoroastrian religion took the monopoly of politics in its hands and it was fully developed into the ideology of the Sassanids politics and its scholastic system, this concept found political / land function was modeled on the whole occupied territory of the Persians where Zoroastrianism domination had been established. The term greater Iran, which was a religious and mythological concept before the Sassanian era, found a political function in the Sassanian empire in contrast to Aniran (Median/Mithraist Mazdak) and it was framed on the whole conquered territory by Persian ethnicity/class. This word was a religious word and under the monopoly of the Magi's religious texts' however, it changed its religious sense into a political / territorial concept and the entire territory occupied by the Zoroastrian Persians after the Mazdak's revolt when the Magi achieved extraordinary influence in the Sassanid system and they codified the Zoroastrian ideological system.

The carriers of this concept were the Pars and Part in contrast to the Medes. Basically, there is consanguinity between the Persians and the Eastern residents. "Parsa was separated from the main ethnic group in the East (Part and Bactria ... ) and they went to Mesopotamia, the similarity of the Persian language and Khorezmi have been proved and... the Persians were a branch of the union of Masazhets with Khorezmians that did not go south, and the difference between the Pars and Part is the difference between the pronunciation of the sounds "s" and "t" and both are the name of the same ethnicity..." (Fri, 1344: 79). The east of Iran was the birth place and position of the Iranians (the same, 191 Parses were of the same race and culture with Kiani-ans and eastern Iranians, and the Persians came from the east to Persia, not from the Caucasus: " Persians came to the present Persia from the path of Tukistan not the Caucasus,, and, in fact , according to the hypothesis – H Kirt and Tomash, they came from Kerman and the East to the present Persian Gulf and the similarity of Persian language and Parthian language with Sogdi is confirmed" (Cook, 2004: 22). Thus, they were so close together not only in terms of language, but also culturally and mythologically. In fact , the Kianians mythologies, which has been nothing but Shah-worshipping and confrontation against the enemies of the king, have been the common mythologies of the Persians and Parthians. "The national epic of the Iranians have originated from north - east of Iran , from the combining the myths of Kianians, Parthians and Skaiids (the same: 318). The root of this concept has been developed from the east, that is, the location of the Pars/Part migration that has nothing to do with the local Medes.

Kurd becoming of the Medes



Following the dominance of Persians on the land of the Mede, which was later called Iran, the Mede became Kurd. The beginning of the Iranian domination was the end of the liberation of the Medes, the end which was the beginning the Kurd becoming of the Medes. The word Kurd, derived from Kartash and meaning slave, was rooted as utilized in the Achaemenid inscriptions in address to the workers and stone masons of the royal palaces. The term Persian has been used as Kret in Middle Persian language (Wikipedia), Kurd is taken from Kret (Nikitin, 1373: 42); Gerdoen of Batlamius is derived from Gorda which is the equivalent of Kortish meaning worker. The term Kort (Kert) is taken from the same Illamid kurtish (Kahlan, 1375: 325). Gerishwich correctly sees the Illamid word Kurtish as equivalent to the Iranian term Gorda (Gerishwich quoting from Diakonov, the same: 304) and the Gordas formed the main working forces in Iran that they were cauterized (branded). The Kurds of the royal court have been named several times whom they undoubtedly are the group or part who were called as Kortish in Istakhr archive in Illamid language and they were certainly as slaves (the same). The Kardokhis of Xizenphon are also the the same Samidized of Toor meaning hero or Champion which equals to kortish meaning the strong-handed workers. Batlamyous and Xizephon have composed their works after Iran occupation of the Mede. Sagrtis mean stone carvers which Hertsfield and Hints know them as one of the ancestors of the Kurds (Hertsfield in Nikitin, 1377, 49; Hints, 1386: 55). The inscriptions of Bistoon and the Greek sources have imputed the general name of Sagarti meaning the stone carver on the inhabitants of northern Kurdistan (Kahlan, the same: 325). Mosa Khorni sees Argam-zan as the son of Sana karim and the the legendary father of the eastern Kurdistan that means the mason (the same: 325). Daruis introduces the Medes as the stone-carvers and the professional decorators of the palaces in Bistoon inscriptions. The word "Kurd" or "Kort" has been used in address to Zagros-residents in Sumerian inscriptions but not in the meaning of the slave but in the meaning of freeman since the Mesopotamian civilisations have never permanently ruled over the Kurds. Therefore, the word Kurd or Kert did not mean slave in the Mesopotamia civilization. The change of words in terms of culture has always occurred like the word "Adam" that meant "hehe", i.e. the "free person", but in modern Babylon era, the slave was called "Adam" (Diakonov, 1388: 303). Therefore, the Medes became Kurds or Kurtis after going under the dominance of Persians. Kurtis is equivalent to Mania meaning slave in the Achaemenid inscriptions (the same). Mary - Pe is the prisoners of war and prisoners, and we should remember that one of sections of Kurtis was called "Kurtish Mary-P. Thus, as the Persians invaded this land, which a large part of it included Ray and Isfahan and called as the Great Mede under the control of the Medes turned into the promised land of the Persians and they named it as Persia. Besides, the Persians encountered hard resistance from near the native Medes whom they were badged as demons and devils in Persian religious culture.

It was because of the above reasons that the Persians, who were able to defeat the Medes and govern them with military power, became as the superior ethnic group and the ruling aristocracy and the Medes turned into the inferior group, slave or the same Kurd. The Persians used their art in building and architecture, and as Dorant said, they utilized their language and written works. The secret of changing the word Mede into Kurd lies in this fact that it is the word that the Persians used to scorn and inferiorate them and tried to make them forget their writing, culture, and even the name of the Mede. The dominant/superior Persians became also the upper classes via seizing the land of the Mede and plundering the surplus of their capital since the Persians and their military became the lords of the lands and products of the Medes

and the Medes were deprived of their productions and lands and became the slave or the same Kurd. Therefore, Arya / Iran, other than the earlier meaning, was in contrast to the Kurd, the slaves and the inferior class, involved the meaning of the noble and the upper classes. The concept of Arya / Iran was used in Ancient Iran to mean the nobles in address to the upper classes, the aristocrats, the clergies, and the princes from one hand (Beryan, 1380: 287). It put stress on its blood and ethnic meaning, on the other hand “this term was also used for the local inhabitants whom the Persians occupied their territories and looked down on them” (Gorlits, 1312: 3) which in both cases, the upper class and the migrant clan were the same ethnic group (Persians). The Persians used the defeated Medes in servitude and architecture. However, they became needless of them by learning the art and craft of masonry and building of the Medes in the work of stone and art. The Mede transformed from the height of authority to the level of the architect and the masons of the Persians. The Persians no longer needed architectural arts of the Medes especially after the advent of Arabs who did not need architectural arts for ideological reasons; therefore, they resorted to the deserts and mountains and became herdsmen. The name of the Mede, which changed from freemen to stone-carver slave, became as the herdsmen and migrant (Aivanov, Aivanov and Makinzy in Wikipid-ia). Then the word became common so that every shepherd taken from Arab and Iranian to Turk was called as Kurd. Nonetheless, the general-izing the meaning of the Kurd do not question the special meaning of Kurd as the Kurd nation. The general meaning of the Kurd has been constructed out of the special meaning of the Kurd nation and not vice-versa. Thus, the misfortunate Medes became well-known as Kurds via the domination of the Iranians. I left away my fortunes and status I became lonely like the Kurd in pastures (Rudaki). The land of the Mede was called the greater Iran through the domination of the Persian spears and the Mede/Kurd became the slave. Of course, it does not mean that prior to the Persians 's onset, the term Kurd has not existed; hence, it was an old word used in Assyrian and Babylon inscriptions, but it was not a common name and similar to the word Adam, it had not meant the slave. By the rule of the Persians and the formation of the term Persia in the territory of the Mede, the term Kurd was re-named as the slave like Mitra that was also re-named. In Shahnameh, there is reference to the borrowing of the art and architecture of the Medes by the Persians:

...نبید جنگشان را فراوان درنگ یکایک بیاراست با دیو جنگ به  
 جان خواستند آن زمان زینهار کشیدندشان خسته و بسته و خوار  
 ...بیاموزی از ماکت آید به بر که ما را مکش تا یکی نو هنر  
 ...دلش را به دانش بر افروختند نبشتن به خسرو بیاموختند

بفرمود پس دیو ناپاک را هر آنچه از گل آمد چو بشناختند به سنگ و به گچ دیو دیوار کرد

...یا آب اندر آمیختن خاک را سبک خشت را کالبد ساختند نخست از برش هندسی کار کرد

Therefore, the greater Iran has been the ruling of the Persians; for this reason, all of the historians and politicians have never mentioned Iran before 1933 and they have always known this land and its sovereignty as Persia. "Iran is a country that was called Persia (Pers-French) up to the decade of 1930s" (Katozian, 1392: 3). It was only in 1933 that Iran replaced Persia with the official order of Reza Shah to the foreign em-bassies of Persia. During the era of Reza Shah, Iran was limited to Per-sia and its language, culture and its elitess. Although Reza Shah's modern government enjoyed some modern ideas, it was structurally in the continuity of Iranian classic political wisdom. It left the monopoly of economy and military power and ... in the hands of central sover-eignty of the Persia, and he carried out the destruction of the language and cultures of other tribes and the imposition of Persian language and culture forcefully, so in either ancient or contemporary time, Iran was Persia and limited to Persia. The Iranian government has always been one-ethnic government of Persia both in the ancient period and in modern era during Reza shah reign against the insurrection of other tribes. Basically, the political existence of the Persians and the Iranian government is subject to the destruction of the political existence of other so - called Iranian tribes. The other tribes, including the kurds, have no remedy except to liberate themselves from under the domina-tion of one-ethnic Iranian government; thus, Iranian government is the tool of the ethnic domination of Persians on the other clans. Within the framework of the Iranian government, it is not possible to obtain the right to freedom, then there is no other way to liberation but complete destruction or complete salvation from under the domination of the Iranian government.

It is both true and not true that Greater Iran is made up of several peo-ple or nations. It is true in this meaning not only the Persians took ref-uge in the mythology of oriental Shahworshipping to preserve their power and gain legitimacy, but "Iranwich" was an extended banquet ready to serve every sort of illegitimate conquest in the history. As Per-sian political wisdom had been based on Shah-worshipping and class order, every sword, that has launched a military campaign on Iran from everywhere in the world, has molded Persian mythology on itself and has known itself as the representative of the divine right. They have done so in the time of the decline of its sword power to preserve its popular acceptance by seeking refuge in divine legitimacy, and in the absence of a popular base, it has relied on aristocratic class so that it filled their pockets with booties. In the absence of popular legitimacy, they had to resort to the creation of legends for obtaining divine legit-imacy and the divine right of kings; further, in the absence of popular acceptance, they depended on the aristocracy and the clergy classes that were the Persians ruling ethnic group. However, the defeated eth-nic group turned into the inferior and lower classes.

In Iranian mythology or the Greater Iran thought, whoever owned more power and his sword was sharper also had Farah Izadi and divine legitimacy. For this reason, Khaja Nizamo-Almol and Ghazali, who were trying to revive Iranian political concepts framed the Persian legitimacy-giving legends of powerful kings on the Saljoghids kings, and they made them, who were Turks and Mogals as the symbols of Zilo-Asoltan (the shadow of the god), which was the Arabicized equivalent of Farah-e Izadi (divine shadow). The kings had become the rulers through the military power, spear and sword. In Iranian culture "the rule attained Farah since he had accessed power; because of this, the rebels who seized power had legitimacy, too" (Katozian, 1380: 14-15). The Persians took control with the force of the sword over a territory later called Iran and they took refuge in the myths of Kayanian king praying in the absence of popular legitimacy. Similarly, Turks and Mogols, who had dominated this land with the help of sword, had the right to take advantage of class myths and class discipline to compensate for their lackage of popular acceptance like the Persians. Therefore, Iran seems to be the right land of the multi-ethnic groups in this context. It was the destiny of Iran land that the other non-native immigrants like Turk and Mogols and ... to take refuge in Persian legends as well because the Iranian myths or Iranian political reason is in accordance with the needs of the other conquering and looting ethnic groups. Thus, what is called as Iranian culture is the same conquest, divine right and class order that the power of the sword defines and determines the borders of its land. Similar to the Mongols who took refuge in Iranian gods and the legitimacy giving myths of Iranian just to gain the legitimacy, the Persians themselves used this rule and they sought refuge in King-praying myths and Babylonian gods in their conquest of Babel to have legitimacy which can not be taken as a reason for Cyrus to be Babylonian.

The Ashkanids and Sassanids dynasties tried to make false family trees and they traced their lineage to the mythological and holy kings (Safa, 2005: 574). Ashkanids did not resort to king praying myths since they had legitimacy in the beginning; however, after the death of Mithridates the second, they revived Kianian king worshipping myths and framed them on themselves when each one had the claim to the kingdom throne in every corner to maintain his power against competitors. After the death of Mithridates II in 87 B.C., Godarz, the ruler of Babylon, called himself as Ashk and King (Zarikob, 1368: 342). Godarz, who tried to call himself as king in the vacuum of power and had no legitimacy in the rest of Iran, sought to restore king worshipping mythologies to give himself the legitimacy. The legendary knights of Kianians such as Godarz is due to this same Godarz who has invented the chivalry root for himself. As Noldeka and Maraquradt have asserted most of the Kianian heroes were the Ashkanids princes who have entered their own names in the list of old legendary heroes (Christensen, 1343: 185). No one tried to revive the king praying mythology of the Iranians in the first two centuries of the rise of Islam in Iran because according to the popular ideology and populism of Islam, the rulers had popular legitimacy, and based on Girishman and Christensen, the populism culture of Islamic made the Iranian corrupted aristocratic culture more corrupted.

For this reason "two centuries of silence" emerged, the Persians had no need to seek refuge in Persian legends or the so-called Iranian culture since they enjoyed popular acceptance because of the Sassanian cruelties and the Islamic humanitarian slogans. Later when the relative justice of the early caliphates constituted the oppressions and the power of the Omawids and Abbasids

dynasties, they sought refuge in the Iranian cul-ture that fitted their power-seeking behavior and conquests. To gain legitimacy, they gradually tried to revive Iranian mythology by transferring power to Iranian militants and aristocrats like Samanids and Safavids. They traced back their lineage to ancient and mythological kings; Persian dynasties traced their lineage to Bahram-e Chobin, Anaoshirwan and other Sassanian and Kiyani kings. "They even traced the lineage of Mahmood Ghaznavi, whom there is no doubt in his being Turk, to Sassanian Yazgerd" (Ferozanfer quoting Ra'isNia, 1380: 57). Up to the time when there was a popular force against the power structure of the Caliphate and it was of popular acceptance, Al-e Boya did not need to take refuge in the legends of the Sasanians/Kianians, then when they transited from popular acceptance to systemized power, they distanced themselves from people and the people movement and they took refuge in myths and so - called Iranian culture. The transition began from the era of Ado-dawla and RoknoDowla. Rokno-Adowla thought of the revival of the divine-based glorious monarchy like the ancient Persian dynasties which their signs are shown well on the silver medals that has been made in Ray and it has been written in the Pahlavi writing system as: The glory of the king of the kings be on the rise (RaisNia, the same). AzddoAdowla counterfeited a family tree tracing its lineage to the Sassanid dynasty to Bahram-Gor (the same: 58). The islamic caliphate, which initially had a popular legitimacy in the rejection of domination and oppression of the Sasanian kingdom in Iran, was in accordance with the counseling and lack of metaphysical legitimacy, but when Abasids lost their popular legitimacy, the Mages of that time , i.e. the priests used royal-worshipping legends and ad they gave kingly divine right to compensate for the lack of their legitimacy.

Therefore, resorting to the Iranian legitimacy-bestoying myths was the result of the lack of public legitimacy and taking refuge in these myths did not mean being absorbed in national culture and identity. However, it was the political ration belonging to militants and not the national and popular culture, because the majority of people living in Iran political boundaries were non - Persian and Iranian culture and legends were on-ly based on the need of power and Persian sovereignty. Therefore, Ira-nian culture is not a popular culture belonging to so-called nation of Iran. The absorption of conquering ethnicities like Mogol and Turks in Irania cuture is not the result of identity convergence of ethnic groups residing in Iran but it is the result of the collusion of conquerors with the ruling Pars ethnic group or with King-worshipping culture to gain legitimacy to have dominance over the serfs. This culture is the logic of looting invaders which lacked popular acceptance and justice. The first plandering invaders were

Parsians/Parthians, and then Turks and Mogols and ... and the legitimacy-givers were Mages, priests and clerics, and the so called intellectuals who are no the representatives of the people but the aristocrats allies of the King to obide the serfs. For this reason, the Iranian nobilities and clergies , like the feudals of Khurasan and the clergies such as Ghazali and Nizamo-Almolk and ... were cooperating with turks and Mogols userpers, as the Babylonian and egyptian priests collaborated with Cyrus and Cambodias. Therefore , what is known as the Iranian culture is merely the culture of the most dominant and plandering tribes like the Persians, Parthians, and later the Turk and Mogol, which is basically opposed to public and popular identity. The culture of monarchism or royalism, class discipline, and neglect of the serfs, and the justification of war and conquest is the thought of Iran-ism. The relation of knowledge / reason and power was as follows: knowledge came from beside the Mages, and clergies like Tansar, Majli-si and Ghazali and the flatterers of the kings and the power came from the behalf of the coquerers such as Cyrus, Changiz and Taimor. This notion that Iran is the thought and

theory is true, but the thought of monarchism and anti - people and giving legitimacy to the kings in the name of divine right of kings regardless of popular acceptance or thought is an important obstacle for the transition to Iranian democracy. It has been so because taken from Kazakh / Russian Cyrus to Mogolian Genghis Khan and Mahmud and the Keshmirian Khomeini all are legitimizing their sovereignty through the legitimacy of the Iranism-royalism thought and they do not care about the people and democracy .

Iranian culture is the same militancy. Beyond the power and politics of government, there is nothing in the name of Iranian culture. This culture is one of the productions of power of the dominant ethnic groups. Iranian culture is the same Gods letters and King letters, dealing merely with the military wars of rulers and the replacement of the dynasties and there is no news of popular culture, philosophy, and art. Therefore, what is referred to as the culture of Greater Iran has been nothing more than the monarchism culture, the military policy and the power of the sword which is solely focusing on the narration regarding the kings. Shahnameh gives the same legitimacy to Mahmud Ghaznawi as to KayKhosrow. Since in Iranian culture, everybody who has more power has more legitimacy and the power of his sword makes him the owner of the divine charisma. Iran is a multi-ethnic land since other tribes like Mongols manipulated this land through the sword and with the legitimacy of “ monarchism myth” and cosmic order like the Persians. However, the Kurdish identity, that is based on social contract, equity and popular-oriented, does not have any contemptibility with Iranian culture, but it is basically generated in contrast to it. The Kurds have never been Iranian nor will become Iranian in the future.

The secret of reviving the Persian language is located here too, we can not flatter the kings through other languages as well as the Persian language. The Persian language was revived by the courtly kings of Ghaznavids and Samanians, since the nature of Persian language was developed along with the mythology of King worshipping and eulogy. The Persian language was restored by some like Rudaki, who were the panegyrist of the kings or by Firdausi who restored the eulogy of the ancient kings. The Persian language flourished with the help of royalism myth in Islamic era. Along with the rebirth of monarchism, the Turkish rulers of Ghaznavi who were looking for their own legitimacy, supported the monarchism flattery language. Language is the home of culture. The use of royalism culture and the Iranian divine legitimacy equaled to the revival of the Persian language and the Iranian becoming of the Mongols and the Turks. Every Turk and Mogol who came from the way resorted to the mythology of Iranism and the Persian language for giving the legitimacy to himself.

It did not make any difference for the Iranian priests, that later became Islamic clergies, who the king was and they gave the kings legitimacy and spreaded their religion just in return for their advantages. Ghazali, Nasraddin Tusi and Majlisi served Saljuqids, Mongols and Safavids respectively to make the alliance of nobles, kings and the priests continue against the serfs. The secret behind the continuation of the Greater Iran is the secret behind the continuation of monarchism and its anti-people being. Persians as the first resorters to these myths had such a right, so did the Mongols, Turks and ... . Thus, Iranian being or becoming of other nations is true

since the Greater Iran and its political reason, that is, monarchism and class order and the unity of the knowledge of the pre-ists and the sword of kings and the properties of the nobles is against serfdom. Iranian becoming is not an art, any historical conqueror that step on its course to Iran will certainly become Iranian. Iranian becoming is not being digested in the special culture of Iran but it is the use of a common source of monarchism/serf utilization to acquire and preserve the power. There is no difference for the next Iranian priests and cler-gies and contemporary intellectuals whether their partner is Arab, Turk, Fars or Keshmiri, just the supplement of their interests and the agree-ment to misuse the other tribes will cause their unity and support. The contemporary Mages, which were the same nationalist intellectuals, gave the same legitimacy to Reza Shah to protect the hegemony of the Persians against other tribes similar to Mages in relation to Sassanids.

But the owners of Iranian knowledge and culture, who behaved with too much tolerance even with the Mongols could not bear the Kurds who were anti - aristocratic and anti - Monarchism. In ancient times, the Kurds were called as the, Evils, Demos and the brain-eater Zohak, In the Islamic era, they were again named as Gens, Satans and Zandigh ... while Turks and Mogols became Iranian again. Contemporary intellec-tuals also considered them as the agents of modern Demons, i.e. imperi-alism and as "the head-cutters". Since the system and identity of kurds is a popular one based on freedom, it is not compatible with the hierar-chical Iranian structure and its divine legitimacy. Therefore, this is why Iranian elites and Iranian culture are compatible with Turks, Mogols and Arabs and etc. and they accept them as Iranian, but they have no ac-cordance with the Kurds at all. The Iranian call Arabs, Turks and Mogols rulers as the signs of the God's glory and Shade. Nonetheless, the Kurds have always been unpopular and they have always been badged as the Gens, demons, brain-eater Zahak and Satan whether in the period when the Persians themselves ruled or when they provided the sovereignty knowledge and legitimacy of the rulers of the Islamic era. They were termed so whether in the contemporary period when the Per-sians ruled under the guise of modern and half-modern ideologies of nationalism and political Islam and legitimacy of the Islamic period. Gazali and the Persian Nizamo-Almolk who gave legitimacy to the Turk-ish kings and called them the shade of God, called the Kurds as Gher-meti, heathen and Gen. Majlisi who called the Safavid kings as the full Islamic leader (Morshid), called the Kurds as the sons of the gens. The more complete example of it was the author of the Shahnameh, i.e. Fer-dawsi who presented it to Sultan Mahmud. The reason is that the the power-oriented political reason of the Iranians, which makes the owners of power as the owners of the God's glory, has not only any contemptibility with the Kurds quest for identity, but also it is in its opposite pole as it is focusing on freedom, basic democracy, the justice of equality and the culture of freedom of Eros. The system of the Kurd is the free-dom and popular system; it is the horizontal system of social contrac, but the Iranian system is the system of conquest, power, and militancy.

The fact that Pars has prevailed its structure and culture and the other nations have thought in its context undergoing its language and culture can not be taken as the legitimacy for its continuation. Not only does the Iranian thought (its monarchism and anti-people myths) have no le-gitimacy but the historical reality that has formed based on sovereignty does not indicate its truth. The truth and the reality of the Iranian cul-ture is rooted in its military domination.

The theory of the greater multi-national Iran has been derived from the bottom of the fact that its legitimacy has gone under question. The long-term historical reality can not become the an ethical and human truth. The reality of the historical domination of man over woman does not bring inhuman legitimacy for its continuation. Iranian writers bring truth and theory from the heart of the fact that it is untrue and must be rejected. That the nations accepted the Persian culture and language and the Persians have ruled over its boundaries signals the penetration of the domination culture and its internalization, not its legitimacy. The fact that the Persians in the ancient time adopted Aramaic language and in the middle time adopted Arabic culture and language were no reason for the domination of Arabic culture and language, but it was indispensable not optional for them to accept it. As a matter of fact, during the modern times when the national self - awareness emerged, the Persians, who had once chosen Arabic, had tried to cleanse Arabic words out of Persian language. This fact that other nations have adopted the Iranian language and structure have been an indication of sovereignty and dominant power of Persians over them and not their legitimacy. What the Iranians say about us (the Kurds), the Arabs said it about the Persians in the second and third centuries. Jahiz, who was among the Arab's subordinates, turned against the Shobi (the peoples) movement that talked of the distinction and separation of the Persians with the Arabs. He writes: : we do not know whether the accessible Resals (dissertations) at the hand of the people are right and original relating to the ancient time or fake and constructed? Since some like Ibn-e Moghafa', Sahl Ibn-e Haroon and Ghaian could fabricate such works and construct such letters" (Jahiz, 29 quoting from Najah, 1385: 256). He also rejects race as the criterion of the ethnicity and instead he speaks about traditions, habits, characteristics, language and being related to an ethnic group, thought and civilization. Up to the time that these commonalities, i.e. common language and culture are present, they will be considered as an ethnic group ... and form the Arabic society under the flag of Arabic government beyond the racial integration (the same: 271). If we pay careful attention to these materials, they are very similar to those the Persians say about the other ethnic groups such as Kurds just to preserve the Iranian state.

As the Iranians rejected it and refused to accept the domination of the Islamic Arabs and they name the secession and revolt against the Arab / Islamic state with honour, rebirth and national awareness, they must also give the same right to other tribes opposed to the Iranian government requiring to revive their national culture. Of course, as the Arabs did not give this right to the Iranians and the Iranians themselves took their right, the Kurds themselves must take their own rights, too. It is true that Iran was the owner of civilization before the religion of Islam emerged. In the same way, the Medes possessed a civilization before the Iranian entered the land of the Medes which later they called it as Iran. However, the metaphysical similarities between the two Islamic and Zoroastrian systems prevented destroying the memory and the traces of Zoroastrianism which later Iranians revived it with the help of the remaining texts along with the weakening of the Arabic domination. Because of the differences in the identity and political wisdom of the two Iranian and Median nations, the Iranian destroyed the whole memory, culture, and art of the Median civilization so that they changed the confiscated traces of the Medes and devoided it out of meaning to their own benefits.



Greater Iran was merely a political / military territory rather than a cul-tural domain. Its culture was the same as its politics, and its politics was the same as its religion. If there had been inter-ethnic cohesion, it would have been based solely on the military and political foundation. Iranian politics and militancy have wrought Iranian consistency. Iran has been exposed to collapse as soon as the weakness in the militancy aspect has occurred in central government from Cambodia to Reza Shah. Therefore, the identity elements of Iranian political reason, such as religion, land, government, culture and mythology have been de-veloped in the face and rejection of Kurds. The Iranian land has been nothing but the occupation of the Kurds' habitats and their isolation. The Iranian religion of Zoroaster had not been developed except by negating and demonizing the Median religion of Mithraism. The Iranian state-empire had the power and the monopoly of absolute monarchy and it was not shaped except by the suppression and military failure of the Median tribal-based democracy. The basis of Iranian mythology has been the carrier of the memories of fighting the Kurds and the conquest of their land. Iranian culture is nothing but the confiscation of the ancient culture of Kurds and varnishing it with Iranian/Zoroastrian color. Persian language was also developed under the decree of Darius by the Illamid and Babylonian scribes in the celebration of the triumph of Persian Darius on the Median Ferawartish, in order to compose the Bistoon inscription and to preserve the memory of defeating the Kurds. The Iranian state-empire is also a single-ethnic state to preserve its interests against the Kurds and other tribes. As the Iranian political wisdom was developed based on negating the Kurds' quest for identity, the Iranian / Persian sword was established by the rejecting and massacring the Kurds. The spread of Greater Iran was the limitation of the Kurd's greater land. The young tree of the Iranians was irrigated with the blood of the Kurds. The rise of the Iranians led to the sunset of the Kurds, as the rise of the sun caused the set of the Mithra. There is one significant reason for the historical despotism of the greater Iran and the formation of strong myths of monarchy well-known under the thought of Greater and worldly Iran. This reason is the illegitimate domination of the Persians on the other tribes which have created strong monarchism to justify its sovereignty and sought refuge in the mythology in the same way the Mogols, Arabs, and Turks resorted to these myths and they called it as the multi-national and the multi-ethnic culture Iran.

#### A pattern of the government theory in the Middle East

Comparing the forms of three Iranian/Zoroastrian, Arabic/Islamic and Kurdish/Mithraist governments

#### Introduction

The political action of the state is based on the nation's political reason. Without the conceptualization of the government, it is not possible to plan its political design. The conceptualization of the state among any nation should be based on the unconscious political and historical identity of that nations. A nation without the unconscious political and

independent national identity could not process government conceptually, and the government's conceptual refusal is the main reason for its political refusal.

Since identity and history of the Kurd have been under the sway of Iranian / Islamic political wisdom, Kurdish political movements have tended to engage in political biggery cooperating with the ruling states rather than pro - independence movements and trending toward the Kurdish state with political action. Unless identity and history of the Kurd do not come out from under the dust of the Iranian and Islamic intellectual / historical dominance, the possibility of conceptualizing the Kurdish state is impossible and this conceptual refusal leads to its political refusal. What we are looking for in this chapter is a comparison of three Iranian , Arabic and Kurdish states which correspond with the three religions of Zoroaster, Islam and Mitra each having its root in the imagination of every ethnic group in their rite and ritual. The Persians, as a result of their thirst for the wealth of the Medes, and the Arab people, as the result of their thirst for the fortunes of Caesar/ Kasra of wealth, conquered/plundered those fortunes; thus, they turned into superior class. Besides, to maintain the dominance and continuity of their looting, they formed the hierarchical administration of the state (empire/caliphate) and they utilized the ideology of religion ( Zoroaster / islam ) in order to legitimize the looting/ conquest , in the form of sacred concepts of booty, Zakat, Jizya, taxes, jihad and ... . Therefore, the production force of the Persian/Arab ethnicities is the looting/conquest and the government (Islamic Caliphate/Persian Empire) and religion (Islam/Zoroaster) is the reflection or the instrument of the ethnicity/ class of the owner of the production force (looting), that is the Arabs / Persians. The destiny of these governments (caliphate / empire ) is one ethnic state of Arab/Pars, and expansionism of Iranian and Arabic states derives their legitimacy from their religion, i. e. Zoroaster and Islam. However, the Kurdish government taken from the Medes is partially represented in the Kurdistan Republic (east of Kurdistan) and the Bashur contractual democracy (south of Kurdistan) and the cantons treaty (west of Kurdistan), not as a result of the thirst for other wealths, but as the result of the social contract for the implementation of justice and disposal of foreign conquest/looting. The Kurds' religion, unlike Islam and Zoroaster, meant the Treaty or the contract (Schmidt, 2006). Therefore, the Kurds felt no need for a powerful state to give it legitimacy for plundering especially the Kurds were neither the owners of a large empire nor holy religion in history. They also did not need a metaphysical God for legitimacy, since their political order was based on compromise and acceptance. Comparing Iranian/Zoroastrian and Arabic/Islamic government/religion with the Kurdish/Mithraist government/religion is an ideal sample of comparing conquest pattern with the contract pattern. The logical result of the Fatah (conquest) pattern is the " shepherd / herd " relationship. The logical conclusion of the contract pattern is also the primitive democracy. The religions of Zoroaster and Islam provided the background for the emergence of authoritarian Iranian and Arabic governments (empire and caliphate) through giving legitimacy to the production force of looting, plundering, conquest and destruction of other lands with religious concepts such as jihad, aggression ... while the Medes/Kurds ritual provided the opportunity for a government based on the social contract whose purpose is not to attack and jihad but the defence and coexistence through sanctifying the concept of contract and non-aggression treaty. The present result of the concept of the Arab government is ISIL and Baath, the result of today's concept of the Iranian government is the Islamic Republic, and the unconscious results of the unfolding concept of Kurdish government

are the Kurdistan Republic (the east of Kurdistan), Bashor democracy (the south of Kurdistan) and Rojava contract (the west of Kurdistan).

The government is represented in different forms and the objective shape of the state comes from the spirit and the religion of any nation. The difference between the Kurdish government with the Iranian and the Arab governments is due to the differences in the spirit and the creed of the three ethnic groups. We are trying to categorize and conceptualize each of them in the following.

Engels categorises three main form of the government as Athenian, namely the class government, the Roman, that is, the domination of the aristocracy on society and the German, i. e. the conquest of the land (Alamdari, 1380: 193). Iran and the Arabs can first be called German and then Roman. That is, the Iranian government was basically based on the pattern of conquest and the thirst of Median/Kurdish wealth, and the Arab government was founded on the pattern of conquest and the thirst of Persian/Kasra and Roman / Caesar riches. Then, the two governing ethnic groups became the upper classes and the nobility of the Iranian / Islamic civilization as the result of the looting of the conquered nations. Another pattern that we can present not as a reality, but as a concept of reality is the pattern of the contract appearing in incomplete exemplenary forms in the Kurdish government from the arbitration and general election of Diako up to the agreemental democracy of Bashor and the present - day cantons of Rojava. Therefore, the pattern of the two Iranian / Arabic governments is the Fatah (Conquest), and the Kurdish government pattern is the contract or treaty. Although, the great historical governments of the Middle East (Empire / Caliphate) were ultimately in the service of the power and ethnic interests and legitimized the ethnic gaps, they are rooted in their ethnic culture, and their religion understanding in which the religion and government are interdependent.

The logical result of the Iranian/Zoroastrian government / empire / and the Islamic/Arabic Government / Caliphate is classifying of the society and the strong hierarchy in which the superior ethnicities of Arab/Fars are at the top and the defeated ethnic groups which lack the government are at the lowest parts of the pyramid. Therefore, the duty of the government is to maintain this hierarchy from the revolt of the defeated ethnic groups in which the dominating group is at the top and leads the others. The task of ideology (religion in the past and today's political Islam) is also the legitimizing the dominance of the upper class and the maintenance of the hierarchy through coercing the defeated revolt-ing ethnic groups with concepts like heathen, demon, polytheism, separatist and the agent of the foreigners; hence, they justify the dominance with concepts such as Islamic Omat, Iranian nation, religious/ national unity, Islam/Zoroaster, multi-ethnic nation/government, equality and ... . Therefore, the basis of the Arabic / Iranian governments, from Ghoreish to ISIS, from Cyrus to Reza Shah, is the production force of other tribes and conquest of their lands. Fatah (conquest) requires both the military power and the legitimacy-bestowing ideology which the government is its administrative / military power and religion is its hegemonic and legitimacy-giving instrument. The religions of Zoroaster and Islam provided the context of Iranian / Arabic governments by sanctifying the violence and calling the opposition as atheists provided the background of the exploitarian Iranian/Arabic governments. Nevertheless, the Kurdish government/contract from the Medes up to the KRG and the Rojava cantons were not seeking to plunder or conquer,

but to protect themselves from looting and control by others. Because their purpose was not plundering the resources and conquering the others lands is no longer a caste, they did not need the hierarchical military power and totalitarian ideology. The secret behind this point that the Kurds have neither owned the conquering/looting empires like Sassanids and Abassids nor a universal religion like Is-lam/Zoroaster is that they have not had the intent of conquering the world. Thus, their religious culture have not intended to conquer the world and conduct the world towards their own religion like Islam and Zoroaster, but their religion has been Mithraism that means the treaty and the social contract.

The government in the west was due to class relations. Although class relations did not appear in the same style in the East, the conflict of interest and the construction of the government as the tool of the power for preserving a privileged group interests in society has been universal (Alamdari, 1380: 152). The first sort of governments have been shaped for changing the servers to the rulers both in west and east (Khonji quoting from Alamdari, 1380: 152). All of the theories regard-ing the development of the government consider it as the resut of con-trast, war and hegemony (Alamdari, the same: 196). However, there was a difference in this regard in the west, for instance in ancient Greece, the government was developed as the result of the class con-flict inside a cultural group called nation today. Besides, the hydrolic government looted the surplus of the same cultural group or in Meso-potamia and Egypt, There was neither the Great rivers such as the Nile and Euphrates to justify the theory of hydrolic and aridity nor class conflict in ancient Iran and among Arabs; therefore, the government was formed as a result of conflict between the Persians / Arabs and other tribes. Consequently, the triumphant ethnic group turned into the superior class and the government as the power tool for maintaining the interests of the ruling ethnicity/class.

Therefore, the human relationship with nature does not appear to be the root of the formation of the Iranian / Arab govrement. The theories of the aridity, eastern despotism and ... do not have the power to ana-lyse the government in ancient Iran, if the nature had had a hand in th development of the government, it would have been indirectly. What is certain is that class conflict theory is not responsible for the devel-opment of the government in Iran. Since there have never existed the classes independent from the state and the sustainable private property that is required to form a class, some researchers mistakenly present the ultr-cass and ultrasociety government theory, and they talk about the conflict between the state and the nation.

While the state has never been beyond the community and it has not been class-based, too. Thus, it does not mean that the governments have not had any social base and they have been beyond the society. However, they have been eth-nic-orieonted governments and the Iranian/Arabic governments have been Pars/Arab one-ethnic governments. The conflict has not been the conflict between the state and the people, but the conflict between one-ethnic state with other stateless ethnic group in which they have revolted in Iran taken from Cambodia

(Gaumate's/Ferawartishs upris-ing) to Mashrota or constitutional (Semko/Khazal and...) as soon as the central power of the dominant group has diminished. Further, in Islam, as soon as the weakness of the central power was observed, the defeated ethnic groups revolted to get rid of the domination from the time of the Prophet Mohammad (Rada wars) up to the era of Saddam (the Kurds). Thus, the rulers have only achieved the possibility of pre-serving the government and subjugating other clans/tribes through mili-tary power. Abu Bakr al - Sadiq subdued the opposition of the Ghorish ruling under the name of Apostate (the ideology of the religion of Islam) with the war. Daruis subdued the oppositions of the Persians' rul-ing with the military power of the Javidan (Eternal) Guard and the name of Demon/ Lying (the ideology of Zooaster). Reza Khaan also restab-lished the domination of the Pars ethnic group and the modern Persian government under the name of insurgency and the agents of imperial-ism with the help of Ghazagh's military power and by justifying the multi - ethnic Iran (nationalism ideology). Some content may be re-peated in this chapter as the political resultant of the whole book is abstracted in the form of concepts.

#### The Iranian government/ empire/Zoroastrianism

Cyrus considered himself from behalf of the God / Ahormazd to have access to the treasures of the Mede/Ikbatan and the domination of the Persians over the Medes. The Medes owned the Kingdom and the Per-sians were primitive disparated tribes. The necessity to obtain the treasures of Ikbatan was the defeat of the Medes kingdom, and the requirement to defeat the Medes was the formation of the Persian em-pire. Furthermore, the prerequisite of the formation of the powerful Persian / Achaemenid empire was a totalitarian and legitimacygiving ideology and the legitimacy which the Aryan mythology and the Zoro-aster religion provided it. Therefore, the underlying structure of the Ira-nian civilization was the plundering of Ikbatan and the conquering of the Medes land. Now we are going to provide more evidence for it.

As the cause of the rising and the emergence of Islam from the lan-guage of the Prophet of Islam (in the continuation ...) was the thirst of wealthes and plundering of the treasures of the Causer and Kasra, the cause of the Persians's revolt was well as the thirst for the Medes' riches. According to Heroudites, the main cause of the Persians revolt against the Medes and the grid of Cyrus was apparently that the Per-sians were burning for the wealthes of the Mede (Heroudetes, 1387: 99-100, Beryan, 1380: 23). The Medes owned a the powerful kingdom and the Persians were semi-wild disparate tribes, who owed their sur-vival to animal husbandry and the hard life of the desert and the plain, according to Katias, the Achamanid tribe of Cyrus were shepherds. According to Herodutes, Cyrus was thinking how to incite the Irani-ans. after a long thought, Cyrus gathered an association of Persians and told them to bring their own scythes ... Cyrus ordered them to clear up a piece of land full of thorns and thistles ... . On the other day, Cyrus killed all his father's flocks including the the sheep and cattle and he served his guests with them and with wine and pleasure ... after the party ended, he asked whom you liked best. They replied: The differ-ence between them was great, and yesterday was a hard and useless day and it was a happy day today. Cyrus expressed his intention ex-plicitly and said that your

situation is in this way, if you listen to me, you will enjoy the banquets and thousands of other pleasures, and if you don't listen, you will never fall into bondage and pains like yesterday's works... I have a duty for your freedom from the side of your Lord, you are not inferior to the Medes, so immediately revolt against Astiag (Herodotus, 1387, 99100). After three years of struggle Cyrus succeeded to defeat Astiag and the Medes, Cyrus looted Iktan and transferred all its riches at Pasargadae (Gerishvich, the same, 644. Diakonof, 390:1388).

Therefore, an agreement was reached between Cyrus and the Persian clan and the nobles by the mediation of Cyrus' father (Cambyses), the content of which was admitting to the leadership of Cyrus by the nobility, and the looting / conquest of Mede and other lands and giving the properties and the lands to the Persian aristocracy. Cyrus's father, Cambyses, tells the Persians that, in order to provide the blessing for both parties, Cyrus must defend the nobility / Persians and the aristocracy from Cyrus. The conditions of this accord, according to Xenophon, existed even in his time (Xenophon, Karimi: 27). The alliance of Kaykhusraw with the heroes – the local governors – against Turanian Afrasiab is a reflection of the Cyrus' alliance with the Persian aristocrats against the Mede (Pirnia, 1383: 132). Among these privileges of tribal nobilities at the time of Cyrus are: "The King has the right to marry only from the daughters of the seven tribal aristocracy; the representatives of these clans have the right to attend the presence of the King without any obstacles, and they have to be the hereditary rulers in their own states. They have the right to wear a special hat. The King should consider the advice of these nobles, and the aristocracy should also support Cyrus in terms of the military force, and Cyrus must change the conquered territory lands as the personal lands of the aristocracy" (Dandamaif, 1386: 225). "There were some compromises between Cyrus and the aristocrats including the conditions of Cyrus being the king and the preservation of the concessions of the privileged classes. Cyrus himself was one of the most influential tribal princes and the representative of the tribes, as the Achaemenid dynasty was one of the seven known tribes" (Dandamaif the same 225-226).

The founding policy of the Empire was consistent with the purposes of the tribal nobility (Wishofer, 1389, 70). The Cyrus and the nobility were conquering for the war booties (Rezai, 1384: 309). The aristocracy treaty with Cyrus was in place at the time of the next kings, including Darius. In the reign of Darius, the royal family took part of the best land of the vanquished nations, and put them into the hereditary property of the royal members and representatives of the Persian aristocracy, and the owners of these lands were exempt from paying taxes" (Ivanov, 1981: 85). After Darius had put dozens of rioting nations in place, he restored the concessions of the nobles of the tribes and these privileges remained to the last moments of the Achaemenid Empire (Himts, 1386: 298). As Plato had said, Darius divided the kingdom into seven parts among his accomplices in the assassination of Samirdis (the same: 298). Up to the end of the Achaemenid dynasty, all of the high military and governmental positions were at the hands of the tribal aristocracy, both in Iran and outside Iran (the same: 299). The sovereignty and authority of the tribal aristocracy in the administrative apparatus of the conquered countries had caused the looting of the property and the weakening of the production forces of these states (the same, 299- 300). Until the end of the Achaemenid dynasty, tribal relations remained in power, and from the moment of the establishment of the Achaemenid dynasty to the last hours of the dynasty, its army has always been in the campaign

(conquest/plundering, Qaderi) (the same: 300). Therefore, as a result of the military superiority of the Persians and the looting of the surpluses and the accumulations of the Mede and other occupied countries, the Persians turned into the upper classes and the Mede became the poorer classes and the slaves. The Medes were introduced as the tax-payers in the Achaemenid inscriptions (Apadana) (Jung, 1385: 90), while the Persians were exempted from taxation (Ivanov, 1358: 88; Cook, 1383: 86). Like Mohammed, Cyrus united the Persian tribes under the leadership of the Achamanid tribe and they destructed and looted the Medes. The dominance of Persian spears on other tribes becomes the main reason of booty and possession of the others land. The ruling class, that is, the governors and their de-pendents consumed by the riches of the community to build palaces, temples, and to provide the costs of their military campaigns (Alamdari, 1380: 157). When Persian military class occupied the lands of other tribes, the King would make the land of the other nations as the personal property of the military forces. The Babylonian clay tablets would represent the Persians that owned a lot of lands and properties all of the properties were in the hands of the Persian aristocracy in the west half, but in the East it is not clear whether they (the land owners) are natives or Persians. Although, Bakerman, Jung, and Fry accept the second view (the land owned by Persians)" (Cook, Gerishwich, 1387: 335:2).

If the Islamic Caliphate was under the monopoly of Arabs and Ghoraish tribe in the name of Imams Ghoraish tribe and close comrade to the Prophet, the Iranian government was also under the monopoly of Persians in the name of the superior race of Arya / Persia, and the holy religion of Zoroaster. The term Arya would mean both ethnical versus local tribes, and original and class sense versus the lower classes that were the same native tribes.

Therefore, Cyrus regarded himself as the elect of God for the plundering of Ikbatan and superiority of the Persis over the Mede. This is the same shepherd/herd pattern that Foacult referred to it. Cyrus and the Prophet Mohammad considered themselves as the elects of God to liberate their people and they promise the land and the booties to their flock similar to a shepherd. "Cyrus were always in the habit of saying these words that a good king does not make any difference to a shepherd. As the shepherd benefits from the herds to care for them, the king will see the obedience from his subordinates to provide his prosperity (Xezephon, Karimi: 258). Islamic thinkers like Ghazali and Ni-zamol Molk have repeatedly described the relation of the king / serfs to the shepherd / herd. As the shepherd has to think of his flock, the herd/the serf is expected to have the absolute obedience to the king.

The Iranian government was the mono - ethnic Persian state under the exclusive monopoly of the Persian ethnic group. The Kheshterpavns (appointed governors) of Cyrus and Cambodia were from the Persian families without exception (Beryan, 1380: 126). "all the Achaemenid Persians Satrabs (governors) were Persians. The fifteen officers of Darius were all the Persians, and also forty top officers, were all Persians. Achaemenid dynasty was changed into a family matter that they only used close relatives and siblings (Cook, 1387, 334). "In the new empire (Persian), the superior group were in the new government ethnically and socially ... and prominent local figures were only their assistants. We call this group the "dominant clan/class" and the most members of these clan/class were the representatives of the families of the Persian

aristocracy , even royal judges were Parsi " ( 126 - 127 , همان , بریان ) . Darius the King says , " Stop the Persian host ... " , " Darius the King , " King of Persia , " King Darius the base of his government on the Per-sian nobles, even the royal judges were Persians" (Beryan, the same: 126-127). Daruis the king says: " ... protect the Persian corp..." , " Da-ruis the king, the king of the Persians". Daruis established the bases of his government on the principle of Persian nobles and Persian ethnic group (the same: 81).

Like Islam, the religion of Zoroaster was also in the service of Persian rule. There is even the possibility of Zoroaster having the agreement with Cyrus and the aristocracy. "Cyrus could have called on Zoroaster, who was well known, in Kashmar (Hints, 1386, 93), since the religion of Zoroaster was the foundation of the Achaemenid empire with the concepts of divine glory and cosmic order providing the legitimacy of killing and elimination of opponents with the concepts of Azhidahak, Dave and Demon.

Palyaro believes that the tenets of Zoroastrianism have been the back-bone of the Iranian concept, i.e. a religious factor and a kind of moral revival that fueled the the first Achamanid ardor for expansionism (Palyaro quoting Newly, 1381: 16). also pointed out that Zoroasteriaanism had given so much power to the Achaemenid Empire that the greatest resistance to Alexander was in the land of Zoroaster (Newly, the same: 17). Zoroastrian Mages found special respect at the court of Cyrus and Cambodia (Diakonof, the same: 175). like islamic jurists, the Zoroastrian Mages considered Persian Kings as the representatives of God having Godly glory (the shadow of God) and also the political order as in the continuation of the cosmic order and Shah of kings as the earthly symmetry, of Ahormazd. Thus, the opponents of sover-eignty and ethnic despotism of the Persians were rejected and sup-pressed under the name of evil, Dave, Ajidahak/Zahak and the lie.

For example, the evil of Zoroaster is the same Median Mithra. The main mission of Mithra was to kill the sacred cow (Zener, Lomel, Ba-yanaki in Kloska, 1385: 48). In Gots, it is the devil who kills the Holy Cow ( Boyce, 1381: 50; Zener in Biangi, 1385: 48; Hinliz, 1385: 125). The demons of Vandidad are directed towards the Medes and the Median gods (Widdingern, 1377:167) . A chapter of Vandid names a list of the impure places in which the Mede is one of the unclean sites and the Pers has been known as pure and away from the evil (Razi, 1385: 66). In Vandid, the gods of the Medes have mentioned into the ranks of devils" (the same: 103). That is to say, the Iranian power has-justified and internalized its sovereignty through the truth of Zoroaster. As we stated in the Marx language: these texts lack any depth, and the hegemonic tools of the Persians domination against the Medes/Kurds. They have seen themselves as identical to the truth and their political opponents as Demon, Dave and Zahak as today that they regard their political opponents as intrigue or seduction Mof-Sedo-Fel-Arz and the agent of imperialism and ...

Similar to the Quranic verse of Ghatalo fi Sabilila (fight in the direction of God) and Jahado fi Sabilila (Jihad in the way of God) in Islam, " There can be seen a violent trace of thought in sacred texts of Zoroas-ter religion ... Kill just with the battle ax or tomahawk (Yasna 31 article



18) ... the faith (religion) that takes battle ax into its service (Yasna 12 article 9). After a special success in the Kingdom of Iran, Zoroaster carried out a military propaganda policy toward the interests of his nation and religion, and the war against the neighboring nations (Hume, Dehbashi, 1382: 248). In the eyes of Ahormazd, the infidels must be destroyed by arms (Yasna 18/31) and someone who harms the infidel with the language or thought or hand has acted in accordance with the desires of Ahormazd (Yasna 2/33). Zoroaster has claimed to put aside the opponents "lest some of you listen to the worshipper's speech since that villain would destroy and decay the family, the village and the country. O, people try to fight and run away the lie worshippers from our land frontier through war and enmity" (Gots: Yasna, Hat 31 article 18). Based on the relation of knowledge / religion with the Persian power, the denotation of lies and the evil are the opponents of politics and the dominance of Persian and the pure religionists are the same rulers as those who processed the religious texts.

"Mazdayasna likened the best religion to a tree whose four branches are those four categories of society ... above all, king of kings has stood. The most complete example of the religion of Zoroaster is the following of religion from the government. The religion and the government are interdependent and the symbol and the crown of both kings is the king of the kings. The Iranian monarch is also the guardian of justice and order, both religion and truth" (Zener, the same: 88). Therefore, the basis of the order and justice of Zoroastrianism is "Asha", that is in the form of a hierarchy and the consolidation of the classes and the unity of religion and state. In other words, religion and state were the power tool of the upper classes, i.e. the dominant Persians ethnic group.

The moderation / justice in the thought of Islam and Iran is contrary to modern thought; it is not equality, but against equality and the preservation of the social / class hierarchy, in which the King / Khalifa is at its head. In the political pamphlets of justice, the attention is given to Saghlab or political domination, not virtue and happiness (the same: 19). The Justice / equality in Iran did not mean today's Justice, it was the divine law of God (Saghibfar, 1377: 168). The meaning of Asha or right is not telling the truth in the political reason of Iran, but it is the system of the existence and the creation (the same: 244). Neiberg and Doshangiman call truth as the cosmic law and universal order. The celestial order is the pattern of the terrestrial order, and the social and political institutions are the material fulfillment of the divine and religious meanings or meanings (the same: 245). The king is the earthly parallel of Ahormazd and the seven classes of the nobles is a symbol of the seven angels of Ahura Mazda in cosmic order; revolt against the king of the kings is the revolt against Ahormazd and cosmic order, which is why kings necessitate the absolute obedience from the followers. We don't have any virtue greater than this point that we must always serve the kings humbly and with humility (the same: 44). He also writes: "There is nothing worse in the world than to appoint the inferiors instead of the superiors" (the tansar's letter quoting from Bagheri, 1378: 207). In fact, the aim of moderation and justice in the thought of greater Iran is the class order in which the upper class is at the top of it.

Therefore, the foundation of the Iranian / Persian state is the looting of the property and the conquest of the land; to achieve this situation, there was an agreement between Cyrus as the

leader and envoy of God and the Persian tribes as pensionerists and nobles. The Zoroaster and the Mages unwritten agreement of accepting Cyrus' leadership from the part of the tribes and giving the occupied lands to the tribes as personal property was reached to give the legitimacy of looting and the killing of the defeated people and the conquest of their land. Zoroaster and Cyrus shared a common enemy: the enemy of Zoroaster was the religion of the Median Mithraists, and the enemy of Cyrus was the monarchy and the sovereignty of the Medes. The common enemy created the alliance of the Zoroastrianism and the leadership and the military power of Cyrus and the Persian tribes. Cyrus and the tribes were conquering the lands killing the people; hence, Zoroaster gave legitimacy to it through demonizing Mithra and dragging Astiag. Therefore, the Iranian political reason is one of the outcome of the interests of Persian tribes (looting and plundering), the Persians' nobles (the preservation of aristocracy with military command and the governors of the provinces), the monarchy of Cyrus in the Empire to conquer, plunder, and the religion of Zoroaster for its legitimacy.

#### The development of the modern one-ethnicity state

The development of the so - called modern Reza Shah state of as well as the old Cyrus government have been Persian one-ethnic government, and the philosophy of government formation of Reza Shah was the protection of the Persians ethnic dominance against non - Fars tribes. The government is an ethnic sovereignty tool in origin and it is not a neutral apparatus pre - existed before and then diverted or mis-used by the ruling party so that the nonFars ethnic groups try to use the state machine in their favour now. The state machines have no power in themselves, but they have embodied ethnic relations in themselves. The Iranian government has been developed as the result of ethnic strifes. The government - is not patient not the agent, as Polanz said on the other occasion. If we say that it is patient, it means that it is the sovereignty instrument of one-ethnic group, then the possibility of using other tribes from the Iranian government will be possible. If we consider the government as a self - governing subject, it means that it is independent of the ethnic sovereignty, and again it will be possible for other tribes to use it. In both cases, the relationship between the state and the ethnicities would be an outward relation, while the government is neither the patient nor the agent, Iranian government is not an object to be owned by Pars ethnic group which we try to have a share in possessing it. The Iranian government is not preceded by the Persians dominance, but it is the resultant or outcome of the ethnic dominance itself. The Iranian government is a relationship that arises from the resultant of ethnic conflicts and contrasts within its own structure. Whether during the early development of the Achaemenid or during the modern state of Reza Shah, the Iranian government has not been a pre - existing item so that the Persians owned it or devoted more shares to themselves from it; in a way that we enter the processes of participation or negotiation to gain a fair or equal share from it, but the Iranian government has essentially been formed in relation to the struggle and policy of the Persians' dominance on Kurd and other tribes. Prior to the Pars ethnic conflict with non-Fars ethnic groups, there did not exist an Iranian government but it was in the same ethnic conflict and its outcome that it reproduced the relationship of ethnic dominance. The Iranian government has illustrated the ethnic relations and sovereignty. Therefore, the Iranian government is neither a political process independent of other ethnic groups, nor it is a mere spiritual tool that we seek to capture or

participate in the process of political struggle. The Iranian government is the outcome of the Persians dominance and the resultant of their ethnic dominance. The convergence and the the unity of Iranian is neither an inward nor a cultural situation but the result of the despotism of the persian government and lack of cultural basis.

It was in contrast to the ethnic Turkish and Turkish movements (Sem-ko, Ghazal and ...) that the modern state was formed. The formation of both the monarchy of the father and son was based on the suppression of the national uprising of Kurds, Semko and Ghazi Mohammad. Albeit, it does not mean that the main factor in the formation of the modern state in Iran was the Kurds or the fight against the Kurds. Certainly, the collection of national and international factors has been involved in this case. But one of the main factors in the formation and development of the Pahlavi system has been the issue and suppression of kurds. As the Faravartish uprising was not the only uprising against Darius, but according to Darius himself at Bisotun it was the most important of them, and the stabilization of the Achaemenid empire became mainly possible with the suppression of the Median movement of Faravartish. At the time of Pahlavis, the Kurdish uprising was not the only uprising and there were other uprisings, including Sheikh Khazal and Kernl Pisyani and ... but without doubt the most important factor in the development of Pahlavis and the modern government was the Kurdish uprisings.

As a matter of fact, the modern government in Iran was developed against and for the suppression of the ethnic / tribal movements. The modern state was a one-ethnic Persian government to maintain its sovereignty over other tribes. Based on Katim, Reza Khan called his main mission the suppression of Semko, and there was celebrations in all of Iran after the suppression of Semko and the Republic of Mahabad in the same manner that Darius, after the suppression of Kurdish movements of Faravartish and Chisertokhma, held celebrations the entire Empire, and moved around the body of Faravartish in all of the Empire as the sign of victory. After the suppression of Faravartish and Simko, the Iranian government/empire was established, and the secret of this violence was not revealed behind the scenes of the Iranian rule of truth. Once more the Kurd question was not resolved, the barrel of the gun replaced the ink pen, and the ink of the pen only covered the blood of the gun.

The development of the modern state was not the result of a military coup, but the support of the intellectuals and the Persian ethnic group for preserving the rule of the Persians with the slogan of national unity. Reza Khan believed in the superiority of the Aryan and the pan-Farsism ideology, which had taken root among modern intellectuals after the first war (Katozian, 1383: 363). "Reza Shah's nationalism treatment with the locals was in a way as if they were dealing with an occupied land ... there was discrimination against non - Persian provinces. All provincial and town governors and ... were chosen among the Persian language speakers and it was similar to the treatment of the whites with the Indians that was of special to Reza Shah. "He became the executor of the viewpoint of the modernist nationalists elites, that he had converted to them" (the same: 435 - 436). This same writer says in another place correctly: "The existence of the Arabic - speaking societies in the south was denied as the result of the Persian-superiority policies of the state. The printing and publishing was forbidden in Turkish. The Kurdish language was officially recognized as a branch of the Persian language

and its publication was banned. The commanders, directors or managers, and governors were from Persian speakers, even the lower rank managers were sent from Tehran and they treated the local people as if they were running an occupied land. There was a wide-spread discrimination against all provinces in favor of Tehran and against all non - Farsi provinces in the interests of Persian speakers (Katozian, 1379: 436). Nazism and Nazi Germany became an official cultural pattern from Reza Shah's reign (Katozian, 1380: 236).

The supporters and theorists of the modern state of Reza Shah were Persianists with the ideology of archaism and it did not develop except by suppressing military power and conquest of other tribes, which other tribes again began to revolt against the rule of the Persians immediately after losing the military power of Reza Shah. Therefore, the Iranian state / Empire has been a single ethnic state based on the conquest and occupation of other tribes from the inception of its development, and the Iranian government has always been the guardian of the interests of the superior Persians ethnicity/class. The modern state, with its deceptive appearances, has the same structure of the one-ethnic Persian government. This issue is quite evident from the support of intellectuals and the residents of the center from the absolutist state of Reza Shah and his suppression of ethnic movements. Long before Reza Shah's accession to power, Kaveh magazine in Germany and later "Iranshahr" and "Farangistan" spoke of the flaring despotism and the strong man for preserving national unity and imposing the Persian language and the suppression of ethnic movements. "The goal of the Iranshahr and Farangistan magazines was to support a general Marshal named Sardar Sepa and his policies" (Asif, 1384: 150). TaghiZade in Kaveh magazine defended the centralization of power and the flaring despotism (Kaveh, no6: 1, 7). The magazine of "Iranshahr wrote: "The revolution is better from above by the leadership of a sovereign and clear - minded individual, the existence of a great Peter is better than the spiritual associations, committees and ... (Assef, the same: 190). The Persians decided to form a one-ethnic Persian state to rule other ethnic groups. After the Russian revolution and the defeat of Mashrota (constitution), 18 members of the Democrat party based on the suggestion by Mohammad Taghi Bahar proposed to start a national political party so as to form the main body of a powerful great government ... (the same: 145). They meant a state like that formed by Atatürk or later in Germany by the Nazis (Bahar, 1371: 27). The leader of the Communist Party, while praising Reza Shah, would assess every move of independence as the British conspiracy. They considered Reza Shah coup (the subversion of Ghajar) as "the overthrow of the bourgeoisie government and as the new origin in contemporary Iranian history" and they evaluated Reza Shah's policy as a national policy. The newspaper "Nasihat (Advise) welcomed Reza Khan on returning from the Battle of Khazal with the elegy (ode) titled as "I (am) Reza (content or satisfied) and you (are) Reza (content) and the Iranian nation are Reza (content" (<http://www.iran-archive.com>, quoting from Amin Ave). Therefore, the infrastructure of all these deceptions is Persian-orientalism whether under the name of the democratic party, the iron will, Toda (Mass) or left party, or religion, political islam, Iran or plural Iran. " Reza Shah was a Fars-oriented nationalist ... Reza Khan was inspired by the Aryan ideology and Persian-orientalism which had penetrated among modernist Iranian, the young intellectuals taught him this ideology ... modernity, centralization and secularism were founded by Fars-oriented nationalist elites (Katozian, 1392: 222).

The central signifier of constitutional nationalism, which was democracy and freedom, became national unity in the discourse of nationalism after constitutional revolution. The reason for the Iranian / Persian intellectuals defending freedom, constitution and pluralism in the constitutional revolution was that they could no longer accept the Turkish sovereignty as the result of the self-awareness that they had gained (conflict between the government and the nation). Therefore, with anti – authoritarian, freedom and constitutional slogans, they dismissed the Turkish rule of Ghajars and sat on the seat of the Chamber power of the Parliament. They could not have the power to maintain sovereignty over other tribes with the Parliament at their hands; thus, they provided the conditions for the emergence of Reza Khan and his tyranny, while the Persians went to the battle with the Ghajar Turks with the slogan of fighting tyranny. The problem was not the dictatorship any longer, since the Persians had accessed the ruling but the problem was the non - Persian societies. Therefore, instead of fighting non - Persian government power with relying on people, they waged war against non - Persian people relying on the Persianist government; hence, the despotic ruling of Reza Shah was not only despicable, but it was desirable and needed to crush other tribes. In this discourse, the main problem of the Iranian society was ethnic, linguistic and cultural distribution or diversity while before Reza Shah's measures they advocated the development and imposition of Persian language and culture among other tribes under the banner of national unity. The only thing that Reza Shah and his ethnic supporters received from modernity was the absolute and centralized government. The Persian absolute government became the symbol of modernity and the progress of history and civilization, and stateless ethnic groups like the Kurds turned into the symbols of tradition, superstition and backwardness, which, were addressed as "aboriginals" with contempt exactly like the Native American or Australian Native Americans. It meant that they were not yet included in the body of the civilization which the Persians had analogized with the government. Therefore, in this discourse, the concept of "aboriginal" to the Kurds does not differ from Atatürk's "the mountainous Turk" in address to the Kurds. Therefore, the modern state in Iran was also a single ethnic state formed for preserving its Persian interests, language and culture in contrast to the suppression of ethnic movements. Iranian national identity and nationalism were aimed at giving the government an ideological basis (Assyrian, 171).

With the formation of the modern Persian government, the languages of other ethnic groups were threatened with the spread and teaching of Persian language. The number of Persian speakers exceeded the number of the non - Persian speakers (Abrahamian, 1383: 177).

important trade centers of other ethnicities such as Tabriz and Kermanshah and ... fell out of boom or slackened and, and Tehran became a major commercial and economic center. The ethnicities were deprived of the military force and the Persianist center government took control of the monopoly of violence and military power, i.e. the same traditional structure continued. Thus, the mono – ethnic Persian government began not only to establish and develop its culture and language, but also it looted the wealth of other ethnic groups and transformed the Persian inhabited centres into major commercial and economic centers. They ransacked the grains of Kurdistan and Azarbaijan, the underground resources such as oil and gas of Arabistan (Khuzestan) and ... and sent them to the Persians-inhabited centers. The same looting and

plundering of property of other ethnic groups continued in a more modern form and under the framework of the law and bureaucracy. The whole Iranian law and constitution is the internalization of the Persian looting and violence on other tribes.

The Islamic Revolution like the constitutional revolution was the illustration of Iranian nationalism. Two religious and nationalist groups, one with the slogan of Islam and the other with the slogan of democracy raised against the despotism of Qajar dynasty in the constitutional revolution. However, as the common enemy removed, the compromise between them turned into animosity. The period of Pahlavis was the time of the sovereignty of the nationalists and the rejection of the religionists who revolted against the Pahlavi nationalism in Islamic revolution as a reaction to their prior expulsion. The reason for this revolution was the condition that had occurred in the structure of the Iranian political nation. The basis of Iranian political reason was based on the unity of religion and the state. Zoroaster was the ethnic and state religion of ancient Iran monarchy and it was not only giving the legitimacy to it, but it was an incentive to form the empire of the Achaemenid. If Cyrus ousted and داریوش (Darius) defeated the resurgence of the Medes under the command of Gaumates and Faravartish with military power, the religion of Zoroaster would give legitimacy to the suppression and killing of the Medes. Zoroasterianism knew the Medes as the symbol of Ajdihak, Demon, Devil and lie through calling the Achaemenid system as good and truth. The union of religion and power in the middle period was reproduced with the Abbasids and Taheri systems and ... in the framework of Islam. Petershofskey considered the Abbasid system as a result of the unification of Sunni theology and Iranian feudalism. The political structure of Sassanids was reproduced in the form of Abbasids, and the taxation of the ancient Iran was recreated in the form of Kharaj and Jizya (tribute), and the priests replaced the Magi in giving legitimacy to power. the divine Farah (glory) of kings was transformed into Zilosoltan (the Shadow of God).

In the Safavid era, the unity of religion and the Iranian government was restored again, not with Sunni Islam but with Shiite Islam and Iranian mysticism. It is claimed that the Safavids changed the Sunni religion of the people of Iran to Shiite, this claim is true and we cannot deny the Safavid violence in changing the Iranian religion, but why there has been no tendency towards Sunni among Shiite Iranians. If they merely accepted it by force, they would return to their former religion, which was in their imagination, but they did not this, why? Apart from the reason of the development of mysticism that had close links with Shiite in the continuation of Prophethood profusion in the form of Walayat (), Ghotb () and Imam (), and, thus, most of the great Islamic mystics were Iranian, the other reason was a political and identity one. The link between the Persians with Sunni Islam still placed them in the danger of the cultural hegemony of the Arabic Islam and the Ottoman Sunni Islam. For Iranians, the bigotry is more important than anything else, and religion has always been a means of maintaining ethnic tensions and ethnic dominance on others or ethnic salvation out of the domination of others. If the religion of Zoroaster was both the stimulus and the means of ethnic dominance over those like the Medes, the Safavids religion was instrumental for the liberation from the ruling of ethnic groups of Turks and Arabs. For this reason, they accepted the conversion of religion from Sunni to Shia from the bottom of their hearts due to the political reasons and for the revival of the Iranian empire, and Shia clerics became the legitimacy-givers of the Safavids military

power. Pahlavi nationalist politics with anti - religious policies created a break or split in Iranian wisdom. This break disrupted the rupture and gap between the different parts of society and the government more, and the Islamic revolution was a reaction to it since the Iranian / Persian ethnicity has always been associated with religion.

Modern Iranian nationalism was first appeared by the movement of To-bacco under the leadership of scholars like Hassan Shirazi. Persians nationalism in the ancient time began with the religious leadership of Mazdayasna and the fighting of Demon dave by Zoroaster. As we have said, the greater Iran was a religious concept in Mazdyasna, which the Persians, that is, the conveyers of that concept were pursuing their Par-adise Lost and they were looting the capital and land of others especially the land of the Medes that was later called Iran, and then, with a tribal / ethnic prejudice, they gained political power. That is, Zoroastrianism became the stimulus, and the incentive of the Iranian political power, and after seizing power, it turned into the means of its justification legitimacy. Modern Iranian nationalism also began with the religion and leadership of the clergies (Shirazi, Tabatabai, and Behbahani and ...). After the break-up and a condition occurring with the Pahlavi regime due to the imitation of the West and Atatürk and ignoring the Persian tradition, the Shiite religion replaced Zoroastrianism – Iranian Hermesism had an important role in the formation of Shiism - or reproduced the same Zoroaster religion. It created the stimulus and motivation to achieve political power and then became the means to give it legitimacy.

Therefore, the Iranian authoritarian governments were not the result of either the dictatorship and the psychology of one person or a natural reason (the theory of aridity), but the political will of the Persian ethnicity and their knowledge –oriented supporters was the main factor in the formation and persistence of the despotic system of the one ethnic - Iranian government. “the pioneers of Pahlavi government were not just Reza Khan and some army officers or the British government ... national and modernism feelings ... were rapidly growing among intellectuals, modernist and ... (Katozian, 1380: 335). They are not capable of maintaining their ethnic sovereignty over other tribes except through power and military force. Therefore, what is known as Iranian culture and identity is nothing more than the hegemonic tool of their ethnic sovereignty and military dictatorship. Iranian culture is the same Iranian domination policy. The power of the Persians is not just in the violence of the military force and army but the main part of it is in the culture and knowledge produced by organic intellectuals. Thus, they justify and legitimize the ethnic domination and the Persians mono-ethnic government through the concepts like the unity in diversity, the tribal confederalism, civil nationalism and the ultraethnic national state, national unity and ... . Unfortunately, the concepts and ideological tools of the Kurds like feudalism, autonomy for Kurdistan and democracy for Iran and ... - not only have no power to confront the Iranian domination, but also they are in the same framework and they are the reproduction of the same Iranian concepts.

Therefore, the main conflict in the Iranian society is not the state conflict with the nation, or the unity in plurality, or the state with the clan, or the class conflict, but the conflict is between the mono - ethnic Persian state/empire and other without - government tribes. The point is in the domination of the mono - ethnic Persian government on other tribes, including the Kurds.

This ethnic superiority leads to the depletion of the surplus of wealth and the resources of other governmentless tribes, including the Kurds, and their transfer to the upper class, i.e. the Persians that changes the Persians into an ethnic superior class. Thus, the ethnic conflict becomes a class conflict. Class / economic superiority had freed many of the Persians from doing handy works and labour and it turned them into doing intellectual work and the production of thought and ideological religion to justify the Persians' power. Consequently, they needed an ideology to justify their usurpation and giving it legitimacy as a power can be removed through violence and spear but their people cannot be exploited as the slaves forever. The single – ethnic empire of Persians needed the ideology to maintain their power and to justify it. Therefore, they have sought refuge in the framework of their time discourse on certain knowledge and ideology for giving legitimacy to themselves. The principle is the justification of the power, and the structure of Iranian political reason has always aimed at justification of power, not the production of knowledge and episteme. In the ancient period, they called on the Aryan myths and the mythical interpretation of the Zoroaster religion for the justification of their actions, their usurpation and the rejection and the ignorance of the others. They justified all the power struggle, looting and usurpation as the symbol of the goodness, the decree of Ahormazd and the prosperity of agriculture. Nevertheless, they described the uprisings of other peoples against the usurpation and the plundering of their wealth and their lands as the symbol of the evil, demon and anti - civilization, and they set them off to the future in the passage of history. In the Islamic medieval period, they considered themselves as the symbols of Islam and, goodness and معارضان the shadow of God (Zil-oAsoltan) and their opponents as the symbols of the evil, Satan, Ghermeti and infidel and ... . With the formation of modern government using the ideologies of state nationalism and political Islam in the contemporary period, they ignore and reject the oppositions of the empire and the mono-ethnic state of the Persians as the separatists, the ethnic superstition, the agents of imperialism, and tribalism.

#### Islamic/Arabic Government/Empire

Similar to Cyrus, the prophet of Islam regarded his mission as gaining hands on the treasures of Caesar and Kasra in the earliest days of his prophetic rising. Caesar and the Kasra were in the hands of two powerful empires of that time, i.e. Rome and Persia. It required a more powerful empire to defeat and destruct the two powerful empires to attain their treasures, which the peninsula, the location of the prophet's emergence, lacked such an empire. The formation of a powerful empire also required an inclusive and sacred religion/ ideology. Therefore, all the efforts of the Prophet were to transform the dispersal of the Arab tribes to the Ummah / Empire and to guide the warfare of the tribes outward. Thus, like the Cyrus' accord with the Persian aristocrats, an unwritten treaty was established between the Prophet and the Arab tribes. The contents of this treaty were: accepting the Islamic religion and the Prophethood of Muhammad by the Arab Ghoreish/tribes, giving the concessions of the trophies/bondwomen to the Arab tribes and preserving the aristocracy and preserving the aristocracy and mastery of Ghoreish in the new Islamic civilization. With their zealotry and power, the Arab tribes expanded the religion of Islam; in return, the prophet put the property, the wives and daughters and the occupied lands in the form of booties/bondwomen in their disposal. He not only preserved the superiority/ aristocracy of Ghoreish on Arabs but also he made them as the master of the entire empire/ Caliphate. The political reason of Islam was codified with the stimulus of booty /



conquest (tribes), the military arm of the Government / Caliphate (Ghoriesh) and the legitimacy of that religion (the Prophet). Its foundation included the economic / instinctive wisdom of the Arab tribes, its masters and nobles were from the Quraysh and its rules were the revelations of the prophet.

Despite the viewpoint of the researchers, conditions did not impose the formation of government on the religion of Islam, but the invitation of the Prophet Muhammad also conveyed a clear message and political project from the beginning, that is, putting an end to the two governments of Iran and Rome and gaining the treasures of these two governments. "The historians mention a man named Afif Kendy, who said that I was a tradesman and came to Mecca to Abbas, the prophet's uncle, during the Haj pilgrimage. And when I was with him, a man came out and pray towards the Kaaba, then a woman came out and prayed with him, and then an adolescent joined them. 'What is this religion?' I asked Ab-bas. He said this is my nephew, Abdolla's son who is the prophet of Islam who claims that God has sent him and the treasures of Kasra and Caesar will be opened to him" (Tabari, Vol3, 1389: 47-48; Ibn-e Asir, Vol2, 1370: 872; Jaberi, 1387: 87). Furthermore, the prophet told the leaders of the Quraysh, who had gone to Abu Talib to complain about him, "tell me a statement so that you can get to the Arab kingdom with it and the Ajams (non-Arabs) kneel down in front of you" (Ibn-e Asir, the same: 882; Tabari, the same: 54). In interpreting the verse 26, the exegetists say: When the Prophet conquered the Mecca, he pledged his own Omat to the Kingdom of Iran and Rome when he conquered Mecca (Azemakhshari, 421, quoting Jaberi, 1387: 87-89). In this speech, the tacit agreement of the Ghoraish aristocracy is evident with the Prophet of Islam. The ghoraish acceptance of Islam and the Prophet's pledge of monarchy, which the tribes' interests / instincts in return to the development of religion were added to them later, clarifies that the aim of the Prophet from designing the Islamic religion was to reach the treasures of Kasra and Caesar and the union of scattered Arab tribes to form such an Empire.

The Arab tribes were scattered and they had numerous gods. To destroy the tribal differences and to unite them under the umbrella of a superior power, the Prophet of Islam first absorbed and assimilated their gods in a great God called Allah; thus, he provided the theoretic background for the sovereignty of unity over diversity. The nobles of the Quraysh and the Arabian tribes also converted to Islam as the result of the political hegemony of Islam, which provided the ground for the mastery and centrality of the Arabia, Quraysh and Mecca. The opposition of the Ghoraish aristocracy was not to the religion but it was due to the economic loss from the profits of the Kaaba idols (Jaberi, 1384:159). However, as soon as they found that Islam was not harmful for their commercial interests, and the new idol of Kaaba/pilgrimage would make more pilgrims to come than their tribal idols. As the result, the trade would flourish resulting in having more profits for their businessmen, (Gibb, 1962, 5) they not only refused to resist Islam, but took the opportunity in competing together to serve it. The Prophet sent this message to them that Mecca and the nobles of the Quraysh would preserve their aristocracy and trade under the banner of the Islamic pilgrimage through changing Ghibla from Beit al-Mughadas (Jerusalem) to Mecca adorning Islamic tradition of Haj. "The pilgrimage of Muslims connotated that the profits of the Quraysh from Haj and pilgrimage would not only be

economically harmful to them but it would increase, too" (Jaberi, the same: 187). Many of the principles of the prophet of Islam are presented along with the business issues and the technical terms of the Quran are full of business concepts (Grunbaum, 33). The nobles of the Quraysh, with the utilitarianism motives, often had a formal belief in the new movement; hence, Islam did not break their economic independence. (Gibb, 1962: 5). The prophet knew the reason for Maccain conversion to Islam and he gave more booties to new-converters to Islam in the conquest of Mecca since their beliefs were fragile. Indeed, the community of the Islam advent, as Bertram says, was a super-tribe (Thomas, 1937: 125). Islam employed and absorbed the compositional form of the tribe (Firhi, 1378: 135).

As soon as the prophet turned from humanitarian slogans to the slogans of "kill in the course of God and ...", the Arabic tribes converted to Islam to plunder the capital of the other tribes. The Islam of the tribes, like the Islam of all Arabs and the Islam of those who were called as hypocrites and the Islam of Ghoraish, were all political Islam similar to the contract that the Arabic tribes signed with the leader of the victorious tribe in the time of Jahiliat (ignorance)" (Jaberi, the same: 206). The first followers of Islam were those that were agitated in the hope of winning the spoils of war and conquest of the lands (Weber in Turner, 1379: 37). The Arab fighters were motivated not due to pure devotion to the prophet, but with the vision of possessing the land and power (the same: 58). The religious war in Islam led to the acquisition of vast possessions of land property because it was after the feudal interests of the land before anything (Weber, 1965: 87). The Arab tribes converted to Islam because of the promise of war spoils or military threat (Gibb, *ibid*). The construction of the tribe not only supported the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) but also it turned to the moving engine of the Islamic state, and the spread of Islam outside the Medina border was also orbiting around the tribe (Firhi, 1378: 138-139).

It was not only the aristocracy and the tribes of the Quraysh that opposed Islam or converted to Islam via the logic of the booty. The logic of the booty and the logic of tribe had an important contribution to the development of the Prophet's government/invitation. The booty was particularly present in the new phase of the invitation (Jaberi, the same: 161). The position of the Prophet as a prophet and a charismatic leader was only achieved by his military and political superiority (Weber in Turner, 1379: 57). The attacks of the messenger to caravans were all aimed at encroaching on the commercial caravans of the Quraysh (the same: 175). As long as the Prophet was in Mecca and in weakness position in relation to the Quraysh, the Quranic verses of Mecca (70 verses) all recommended the patience. But when he migrated to Medina and signed the joint defense agreement against the Quraysh, the verses of fighting "fight in the course of God" descended which allowed Muslims to enter the war with the Quraysh (the same: 173). Verses 1 and 41 of the Anfal Surat declares clearly that what was captured from the infidels through force, four fifths of them were given to the fighters. It is interesting to note that the Surat of Anfal descended after the Ghazva of Badr which describes how to distribute or divide the war booties (Jaberi, the same: 179), as Muslims quarreled about the spoils of battle (Ibn-e Asir, Vol3: 961). The invitation of the Prophet was not only invitation but also a government (Jaberi, the same: 195). Indeed, the Islamic state was a Goraishi government and the instrument of the dominance of Ghoraish on Arabs as long as it was in Arab Peninsula but after extending to Iran and Rome, it became the Arab/ Qureshi government and the tool of

Arab hegemony on non - Arabs. The internal system of the Islamic state was also based on the tribes' heritage and tribe' it preserved its life pattern in the sense of Omat (firihi, the same: 140). Indeed, Islam abrogated (annulled) the traditions of the Arab tribes, including theft, looting, sexual assault and the Arabic warfare, and it revived and spreaded the tribute, taxes, Zakat, bondwoman and polygamy and Jihad. "Islam adopted the main concepts of tribal humanity and gave them new and religious content" (Izotso in Turner, the same: 61). Sexual tendencies were an important factor in shaping Muslims' education about family and marriage (Weber, the same: 59). Instead of Arab tribes' invading and infringing each other, Islam united them, and it concentrated their force, looting and aggression towards the non-Arab tribes. "The nascent Muslim community had to press its power out-wards as soon as the internal security was provided and bloodshedding was prohibited... the efficiency of this system was dependent on an able and mobile military force" (Turner, 1379: 144). As Max Weber said: The social carriers of Islam were the fighters of the Arab tribes. Islam accepted the spirit of pleasureseeking especially in relation to women, the luxuries and the assets (Weber in Turner, 1379: 20). Islam and the Islamic Caliphate was also used as the hegemonic tools and the military tools in the service of empiriristic Arab aggression and the preservation of Arab domination of others. The Government / Islamic Caliphate became the "real estate owner" and the Arab elites, who enjoyed the advantages of land and per capita taxes, were at the top of the stratification system (Turner, 1379: 149), and other turned into its public slaves. In fact, the Prophet of Islam made a compromise between the commercial desire of the Ghoraish aristocracy and the claims of the booties and the warriors of desert tribes in light of the teachings of text of Quran. "The unique driving force of Islam came from the temporary fusion of skilled forces and the urban leadership with nomadic power" (Weber, the same: 60). Therefore, the religious content of the initial period of Islam is considered as a secondary phenomenon and its main phenomenon is victory and the worldly triumph (Weber, the same: 66).

Abu Baker, the first Caliph, understood the logic of the Prophet's message and the philosophy of Islam. He had, indeed, inherited the political talent of the Holy Prophet of Islam, which he did not separate prayer and Zakat from each other. Abu Bakr knew well that, if the bloods of the spoils – under the name of 'Zakat and ' - - cut off, there would not remain the possibility of forming an Islamic empire to set up the prayer in it. He knew that the renunciation of Zakat means canceling the relation of sovereignty and renunciation of the land (Jaberi, the same: 222); therefore, he announced many of the Arabs, who still had retained their religion, as apostate and declared war upon them through the justification of Islam and renegade from religion. In reply to the companions who asked him about the decree of war with those who believed in Islam and monotheism, he said, "I will wage war with any-one who makes a difference between prayer and Zakat, and by Allah I will make war with them if they refused to pay a goat" (Maghdasi, 1374: 988). Like the prophet, he discovered the relation of plundering (Zakat) with the ideology of Islam as the principle of Islam was the thirst for the riches of Persia and Rome (Caesar and the deficit) and the blood vessels of Islam was the economic invasion under the name of Zakat and tribute. This can explain why he went to the war with Muslims and only for the plundering under the name of Jihad in the way of Allah. Interestingly, Ghoraish, who converted to Islam later than others and their faith was fragile, did not come back from Islam and did not become renegades, since the Prophet's government/ invitation

ended in Qureshi's government (Jaberi: 207). In the death of the prophet, when the people of Ghoraish tried to return to the religion of the time of ignorance, Soheil Ibn-e Omro, one of the aristocrats of Ghoraish forbade them to do so and said: "' Don't be the first rene-gates from the religion, ... Muhammad's religion will win over; I saw him in the same place that he said to me to give him a word so as to tame Arabs for you and to make Ajam pay you tribute ... I swear to God that one day would come so that you could gain the treasures of Caesar and Khosraw (Ibn-e Asir, vol3: 1198). Therefore, contrary to Ali Abdul Razzaq, Rada (apostate) wars were not the beginning of the caliphate / Islamic state, but the continuation of it since the time of Prophet and the Zakat was the tribute / ransom that the conquering tribe would obtain from the defeated tribe (Jaberi, the same: 206).

With the surplus of the accumulation of the other tribes coming down to the peninsula, Mecca and Medina, the Arab nation, which had firmly established its superiority, became the upper class, and the de-feated tribes had retreated to the lower class. The Islamic/caliphate government also became the tool to preserve the superiority and reproduction of the dominance and the interests of the top Ghoraish/Arab class/tribe. Islam also served as an ideological tool for the interests of the Arab people. The opponents of the authority and the sovereignty of the Quraysh were rejected and suppressed, as the infidel and the enemies of God and the Ghuraish made the people come under the obedi-ence to Arab rule and dominion in the name of Atiollah ... (obey the God and its messengers), Daro Salaam (the house of peace), destiny, the Arabic language is the language of God, Aemato min Ghoraish (the leaders are from Ghoraish), Ahlol Beit (the members of the family) and ... . Ghorish aristocracy appeared with the new dress of Aemat o min Ghoraish (leaders are from Ghoraish), Sahaba (the friends), Ahlol Beit (the members of the family), the overtakers in Islam. Due to the com-munication facillities of the world in that time and the vast geograph-ical distance, it was natural that the companions and the overtakers in religion could not be among nonGhoraish and non - Arab, as the Prophet had not appeared among them. Thus, the Ghoraish/Arab aris-tocracy was restored in the form of Islam. Therefore, the principle of Islam was the dominance of the strategy and ideology of the Arabs over the non - Arabs, and the Islamic state/Caliphate was also its mili-tary means which were the surface structure or the reproducers of the production force and the interests of the Arab /Ghoraish tribe. The producing power of the Arab tribes was also plunder and pillage in the name of Zakat, Jizya, tribute, booty, and ... so that as a result of loot-ing / tribute, the Arab peoples became the upper class.

With the deterioration of the Arab prejudice and superiority at the time of Abbasids, the Islamic Empire had lost the element of social solidari-ty, and the new regime had to exploit religious institutions to create a new sense of political identity. Under these conditions, which the particular face of the later Islamic society, i.e. the union between the Cali-phate and the ulema extended out..., the scholars prepared the legiti-macy for the government and demanded that the law be accepted as divine revelation and and a fixed phenomenon (Turner, 1379: 152). It was at this time that the Islamic knowledge and scholars such as Mawardi, Nizamo- Almolik, Ghazali and other Jurists preserved the hi-erarchical order and Arab hegemony under the name of Islam and through caaling the caliphates as Zilo- Solta (the Shadow of God), sanctifying the government and clling the opponents as atheists along with the decling of Arabic predujice.

Imam-e Shafei makes it impossible to separate the meaning and interpretation of the Quran from Arab linguistics, and in particular the narrative of the Quraysh, and he considers Ghuraish's understanding of its text as the best understanding; therefore, he knows the sovereignty of the Quraysh as the necessity of the religion" (Firhi, the same: 235). In Shafei's view, the caliphate is exclusive to Ghuraish; thus, A Qureshi is legitimate Caliph who dominates through force and sword and ...; any opposition to him will be regarded as one of the referent instance of heresy (AboZaid, 1996: 62; Ahmad, 1975:327).

The similarity of the pattern of the Iranian and Persian government was due to the religious similarity of the two peoples; it seems that the pattern of the Prophet of Islam in founding the strategy of Islam was Zoroastrian Iran. The Prophet of Islam borrowed the concepts of heaven and hell and the other world from Zoroaster. As the religion of Zoroaster was a tool in the service of the Iranian monarchy system to plunder the surplus of capital of other ethnic groups, the religion of Islam was also a means of serving the interests of the Arab people and the Quraysh. After the spread of Islam and the conquest of other tribes, it employed the imperial tax code of the Sassanid monarchy. Islamic tribute was based on the Sassanian method (Frye, 387) and the jurists' attempt was to justify its historical records, to reconcile it with intellectual standards and to put them in the form of Sharia (Lampton, 1345: 88). There occurred no change and progress in Iran with the advent of Islam; the capital moved from Tisophon to Medina, and the local tax principles and indigenous social order remained in place, and the strong local men were still ruling" (Frye, 386). The administrative organization as well as the integrity of the religion and government were still among the fundamentals of Islam and as the example of the Sasanian kingdom (the same: 388). The divine charisma of the kings - as in Tabatabai's words - were interpreted as Zillo-Soltan and the Caliphate system accepted the traditions and the customs of the Sasanian governmentality (Petroshefski: 72). The four social classes of the Sassanians remained as before in Islam... only Islam took the place of Zoroastrianism (Frye, the same: 387). The administrative apparatus of the Abbasids system was a full imitation of the Sasanian empire, and the tradition of dynasty and hierarchical system and ... continued as before (Garsowit, 1385: 231). If the main pursuits of ShahNamas and Khodai Nama's in the ancient Persia were around the truth and the legitimacy of the Kings, the loyalty of the serfs to the Kings and the eternal struggle between good and evil (Lazar, Cambridge, 1379: 538), the main interests of the political jurisprudence and Islamic knowledge (ShahNamas and ShariaNama) are centered around the truth and the legitimacy of the Caliphate, the serfs' loyalty towards Caliphate system and the continued conflict between Muslims and infidels. However, it is clear that the men of goodness / justice are the masters of power and the men of evil are the oppositions of power. It is interesting to know that the fixation of the Abbasids position was after the suppression of the Kurdish insurgency of Khoramdinan.

#### The state / material contract

The paradigm of Kurdish government, unlike the Iranian / Arabic government, which was the pattern of conquest, was the pattern of the contract. We do not have any documents in which Diako considered himself as chosen by God or encouraged his own people to plunder the treasures of the other tribes, as a God beyond the earth did not mean anything in the Mede. These were the Median tribes who chose Diako as leader without any promise of

booty/conquest and merely as the re-sult of the fame of his justice. Thus, the Median government and its leader, unlike Muhammad/Cyrus, was not chosen by God, but it was chosen by the people and from the bottom to the top, and its aim was not domination and plundering, but it was justice / arbitration and dis-pos-al of the domination and plundering of the other (Assyria). God was the same as king in the Mede, he was the creation of the people's con-tract. "According to Herodutes' narration, when lawlessness had spread in the Mede, a person named Diako actualized a government out of naught as the result of the tribes' agreement and the legal protocol (Mu-son, 2009: 459). To examine this more, we quote from the father of the historian, Herodutes, who wrote: "The Medes were in the sporadic vil-lages and they had no central government; thus, anarchy spread out all across that land. Diokes, who was a prominent man in his village, prac-ticed justice with much zeal among his fellow countrymen ... . The people of the village, who observed his greatness and magnificent, chose him as a judge of their differences ... (Diokes) gained so much credit among his fellow countrymen that attracted the attention of the people living in the surrounding villages ... they referred their numer-ous quarrels to him to ssolve with content (Herodutes, 1387: 76-77). As Herodutes has also pointed out, the Median government was based on arbitration and the need for judgment (Mirzaee, 1379: 233), acceptance, popular choice, and ultimately repelling the foreign enemies. Unlike Iranians / Islam, there is no mention of the divine right of kings (meta-physical legitimacy), royal race and ancestry, the thirst of the pursuit of other nations' riches and gaining the plundering in the Median govern-ment. As a matter of fact, he was known due to his respect in judge-ment among the members of the tribes (Bivar, 2005: 342). People chose Diako as the judge (Kuhrt, 2010, 34) and the contract was the builder and the founder of the Median government, a government that stepped from non-being into existence merely as the result of the people's con-tract and content; this was the same Mithraism that we talked about before. Despite the other religions, there are no predetermined princi-ples and rules in the Mithraism and it is only the contract that enters Mithra from the abstract non-existence into the existence of the society which we will come to it in the following.

Gerad Newly, who rightly observed the trend of choosing the king among the Persians and the Medians, was able to observe a transfor-mation in this procedure. He testified an association (the general election) in selecting Diako in the Mede – as based on the reports of Herodutes - and a divine or Godly sign of Cyrus (chosen on behalf of Allah) (Newly in Wishofer, 179). In a description given about the selec-tion of Dieokes to the kingdom among the Medes, Herodutes talked of the real choice (Munson, 2009, 461). The king of the Mede was chosen as Diako based on election and it was in a time when the power was suspended and the best form of government guaranteed pioneering the state order (Dewald in Morgan, 2003: 28). The reports of Herodutes about the choice of the king amog the Medes corresponds well with what Strawbon states: " This is a Median tradition; they elected the most fearless person as the king but only among the residents of the mountain" (Widdengern, 1390: 148). Therefore, the Medes received their king by choice (the same, 149). The site of this choice was Heg-matane, which means the place of society and the agreement (Girish-man, 1388: 116). Thus, the Median government was from the bottom to the top as the result of the social contract and based on satisfaction and with the goal of justice and disposal of plundering/foreign domination. It was unlike Iran / Arabs in which the government was from the top to the bottom (hierarchy), elected

by God, and with the promise of plundering to them, and instead of consent, they imposed the leadership as the result of plundering promise and through threatening and reward.

The government/contract of the Medes did not tend toward dictatorship and hierarchy around an ethnic group or a sacred leader even after the fall of Ashur and becoming more powerful. It remained a plural system where the other ethnicities / tribes were not considered as slaves nor as the conquered tribes, but they participated in the Median government via contract/treaty. For instance "the Medes which were described by the Assyrian inscriptions were 27 independent kings, and there is no account that the internal situation of the Mede tribes has evolved along the lines of the union of the tribes and the superior chiefs who could be called as the king of the Mede (Beryan, the same: 41). Even, Liverani do not accept the Herodotes' view of transition to superior chiefs such as Diako and Hokhestera because there are references to "Bil Alani" meaning "City Lords" and also to the number and plurality of the kings in Zagros region of the Mede in all sources. City lords have only reached agreement to confront Ashur under the command of the superior leaders and after the defeat of Ashur, they have immediately returned to the old plural order of the kings (Waters, 2201, 245 - 46). Throughout the period that the Medes were at the peak of their glory, the selection was the only rule that determined the theory of the Imperial successor (Liverani, 2003 [ 2 ]. In accordance with the Assyrian sources in the Mede, the city lords were governing and there is no document accounting for the existence of the royal lineage that other tribes have accepted its authority (ibid, 4). The leadership of Hokheshatara was also actualized not by removing the local rulers but by being appointed from their part (ibid, 7). The Medes dominance over central Asia was more like alliances with local elders than the formation of the empire (Beryan, 1380: 35). By transferring the government from the Medes to the Persians, the government was changed from the arbitration and judgement between the people the government and sovereignty over the people (Rezaee, 1384: 12), it turned from the popular government into the government over the people.

The success of the Hokhshatra rebellion was the result of the free people of the Mede, and the Median kings have relied on the vast masses of the free people against the aristocracy of the nobility (Diakonov, the same: 256-257). The country of the Mede was made up from the autonomous and independent countries (Rezaee, 1384: 204), and the Median kings were not the plenipotentiary kings (Diakonov, the same: 180) because they relied on the vast masses of the free population (Rezai, the same: 206). All the empires of history were concentrated and administered with strong despotism and hierarchy; thus, it is difficult to imagine a powerful Mede without the strong concentration and hierarchy for many researchers, so many have doubted the existence of a powerful and unified Median kingdom (Astronakh in Kertis, the same: 206). They were unaware that the main force of the Mede was not the concentrated kingdom, but the participation of the people force and the contract of the tribes, and the military force of the Medes like today's Pishmargas was the same people and the freemen, and the military force was at the disposal of the community rather than the government. See the previous chapters: The Median Government ...).

Zoroasterianism was the foundation of the Iranian political reason and Islam was the foundation of the Arab political reason. Thus, we should ask what ritual the identity foundation of the Medes was in the period when the divine right of kings and king-priest being was the currency of the time. We say that the Medes chose their kings according to social contract and general election (not in its modern and democratic sense). The ancient ritual of the Medes / Kurds was Mithraism. It was not the Mithra that was sealed as Zoroastrian/Iranian and its meaning changed into sun-worshipping, but an earlier Median Mithra that means the so-cial contract. Thieme regarded Mithra as equal and analogous to Rous-seau's social contract and even more progressive than it. Mithra was a Median/Kurdish ritual (Widdingern, 1377: 170; Herodutes in Cristen-sen, 1382: 70; Houfer, Kloska, 1385: 365; Rostampour, 1381: 26).

"Mithra means treaty and contract, and there is no evidence that the term Mithra originally meant as light or sunlight" Schmidt in Kloska, 1385: 388-390). Mia conceived Mithra as the embodiment of the Treaty of Justice as Temith which in Greece is the visualization of justice (Mia as quoted from Schmidt, the same: 387). Then Paul Thieme defended the " Mia" theory that Mithra is a neutral concept meaning the Treaty (Hofer, Keloska, Ibid: 361). The Concept of Mithra ... is the holiness of official exchanged vows, contract, covenant, and contract ... As Mia has proven Mithra is not the God of the Sun or any other natural phe-nomenon that is considered as Go , but the embodiment of the sacred concept of the Treaty " (Thieme, Keloska, the same: 554). (see the dis-cussion about Mithra, the Contract or the Sun)

In contrast to the contractive order and agreed or negotiated justice of Mithra, Zoroaster placed the cosmic order and class justice of "Asha". The political order derived from Zoroasterianism becomes the hierarchy and the divine right (divine Farah or glory) in Achamanids, and the political order originated from Mithra becomes the horizontal order and social contract of the Mede. Although, the Median ritual have turned into Shiite Islam among the Fars people and Zoroastrianism have struck an intellectual vacuum among the Kurds, they have remained in their historical unconsciousness. Their present political illustration are the Is-lamic Republic in contrast to the earthly KRG in the south of Kurdi-stan, Rojava in the east of Kurdistan and the programmes of the politi-ca parties in the East of Kurdistan).

The politics in Mithra religion is not defined in terms of pre – defined earthy and customary laws; the collective agreement itself (Hegmatana) is the basis of the law, while Plato presented the theory of the perma-nent laws of government and politics as opposed to the theory of social contract of the Sophists, which he probably derived them from the Medes. "The rule - based government in Plato's theory became the eternal property of the human culture. The ideal government of Plato was the example and criteria for the human actions" (Cassirer, 1377: 156157). In the given society of Plato / Greece, everything in the name of the individual and the personal life has no meaning, and the interests of the individual are the same as the interests of the state (Lambton, 1387: 31), the government is also defined by the already defined nor agreed rules upon not the agreement of the people. The philosophy of the Middle Ages and those like Augauostin also define the government according to the laws and principles of pre -



defined heavenly religions by replacing the thoughts of God instead of the theory of Ideas (Forms) (Cassirer, the same: 157), the city - God instead of the philosopher-government.

In the Jewish thought, there is legislation beforehand in which the man should learn the goodness and evil from God and his voluntary revelation (Cassirer, the same: 161). Even the modern theory of social contract did not mean the social contract in the real sense of the word.

John Locke's social contract was only to ensure the enforcement of the pre-existing natural laws. In Hobbes' theory, though unlike Locke, there were no pre-existing and natural laws, but the contract led to the absolute sovereignty and the people finally would consign the king the right to legislate. Rousseau also molded the general will on the life of the individual. The Iranian government / imperial foundation was also based on the classification of goodness and evil, the king's representative from behalf of the absolute goodness, and the elimination and destruction of the opposition with the force of the goodness. The Iranian government was based on the King (Shah). The origin of the law always depended on the will of a person and the law could not exist without this person. The preexisting principle of absolute sovereignty of Shah has continued to mold its form on the material of the history, representing the rule of Ahura - Allah, from Cyrus to Khomeini despite some historical gaps. However, in the ritual of Mithra and its objective instance in Guthi/Mede, as there is no pre-defined rule, the government should be established and reviewed at any moment and according to the agreement and consent of the people. People's consent is the only existing law. Contrary to Ahuramazda who establishes order on the basis of obedience, in the way of getting to Ahuramazda, obedience is superior to all the things (Hinle, 1385: 76). "Based on the Treaty, Mithra regulates the society" (the same: 119). The difference between the consensual Government of the Medes and the Iranian government of the Divine right is due to the difference in their creed and culture. Zoroaster is an aristocratic or a governmental hierarchical religion, while Mithra is the equality and justice-oriented religion. "The ritual of Mithra necessitates brotherhood and adores it, but it ignores the nobles and it requires the government of justice (Bahar, 1384: 453). In contrast to the myths and the ancient epics, which proves the aristocratic structure, there are some myths such as Mithra which are skeptical and rebellious to the current structure (the same: 454).

The rebellion of Mithra is the rebellion of agreement and the common sense of the human being against the divine and godly wisdom and metaphysical law since agreement is the law itself in Mithra and there is no law before agreement. "There is one thing sacred regarding the contracts and it is their certitude and solidarity. The god of Mithra only supervises the non-violation of the treaty, whether the treaty is fulfilled based on the common method or not, whether the words used are right or not is not related to him. He is only seeking to preserve the covenant whether right or non-right, if the enemy keeps the treaty, Mithra makes peace with him and if the enemy breaks the treaty, Mithra enrages at him (Thieme, Alikhani, the same: 37). As Thieme has pointed out, Mithra does not care whether the contract is right or wrong, how it is undertaken, and whether it is Ahormazdian or evil. The treaty itself brings the right and justice into existence and there is no right and justice between people before the treaty itself. There is no taboo or pre-determined principle even in sexual relations. The traces of Mithraism can be seen in Kurdish Mazdakids and Khoramdinan in which the Islamic historians like Maghdasi and Ibn Alnadim have referred to sexual freedom among them on the condition of the woman's consent<sup>73</sup>. Besides, Herodotus has pointed to the political form of the contract

with regard to the selection of the Median Diako and Assyrian and Babylo-nian inscriptions have indicated them in reference to Mannai and Gothis as we said before.

Probably, like the Plato's constitutional government and the laws of Ahura Mazda, the theory of non-origin and eternal laws of Greece was a reaction against the artificial law of Mithra. In Greece, moral rules have no origin, as they have always existed like the laws of geometry. They were the absolute rules that have no beginning, no ending, and they have always been eternal (Cassirer, the same: 159). In religious civilizations such as Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity, the invariable and absolute will of God is the source of laws which do not change except by God's will as well. Modernity defined the moral / intellectual rules/general laws, too. It replaced the reason and subject with God in religion and the theory of ideas (forms) in Greece. In all three cases, rules and ethics were more sacred than the individual life, and the individual must adapt him/herself to the pre-existing sacred laws. However, there is no such an absolute goodness and evil in Mithraism "Mithra was the master of peace and non-peace ..." (MehrYasht, paragraph 29), which the absolute and meta-humanly laws would be defined on the basis of it. All civilizations had the background for the sovereignty of general principles on the personal subjective mind of the individual, while there were no pre-determined rule and no pre-defined goodness and badness, and it saw all social relations ranging from the most private sexual relations to the most significant political relations as based upon consent and contract. Thus, it destroyed the possibility of any rule of non-personal dominion over the individual's personal lives and the possibility of political dominance and despotism under the name of the sacred law. The satisfaction and agreement of the parties was more important than any goodness and badness, the satisfaction agreement would construct goodness and non-satisfaction of the parties would make it as bad. Apart from the agreement and the contract, there was no goodness and badness and goodness and badness are the reconstruction of the mind of Plato, Zoroaster, and ... in contrast to Mithra in whom peace and non-peace, goodness and evil are not distinctive in him.

The contract is usually made between two humans, groups, ethnic groups or governments that are equal (ethically). Certainly, one of the essential bases of Mithra is justice, not Platonic/geometrical justice, but the stoic and equality justice, since in case there were not the assumption of equality between them, all the emphasize on the agreement that was based on the consent of persons would constitute the inferiors' compliance to the superiors or the unity and obedience. In stoic and Christianity thought, the equality-seeking justice was the principle. Nonetheless, in spite of the metaphysical absolute truth in which the King / Pop would take his power from God and his power and his power was a moral/divine power, the secular order would acquire the true immortality against which the any revolt was considered as the re-volt against the will of God (Cassirer, the same: 188-189). Therefore, it would neutralize the concept of equality; hence, leading to the hierarchy which was the result of the impact of Mithraism but from the filter of Zoroaster/Plato.

Thus, contrary to Islam and Iran, the Median government was not based on plunder, infringement, domination or oppression, but it was the result of the choice of collective rationality and on the basis of social contract and repelling the foreign invasion (Assyria). If Islamic political wisdom is reproduced in the Wahhabism and Isil today, the Iranian political wisdom would be reproduced in the Safavids and the monarchy of Pahlavi and .... However,

the Kurdish political wisdom is also partially revamped in the agreed democracy of Basur (southern Kurdistan) and today's Cantons in Rojava (eastern Kurdistan) and ... which are based on the internal agreement and the repelling of the foreign invasion.

That the Kurds were not the owners of the great empires in history is because the nature and - as Aristotle - the form of the Kurdish government is in conflict with occupation and looting. Today the Kurds use the names of the Switzerland cantons and modern western concepts like federalism to describe their sorts of governments, but their nature is deeply rooted in the Kurdish /Median political wisdom, and they are the reproduction of the same Medes' arbitration and the ISIS is the same Assyrian government religion. Kurdish Mithra, unlike Islam and Zoroastrianism, is not the hegemonic tool of domination and giving the legitimacy to killing and plundering, but it is a social ritual meaning the agreement which delivers the message of satisfaction and cooperation and equality. Mithra / contract is in contradiction to domination and hierarchy because the condition of the agreement is consent and free-dom of choice.

## Conclusion

What was stated in this chapter was the comparison of the principle and nature of the three government of the Iranian (the empire), Arabic (the caliphate) and Kurdish (social contract), as the result of their religious culture and understanding (Zoroastrian, Islam and Mithra). The method of the study was the comparative work and the analysis model of Marx's sociology in which we changed the criticism of heaven into the criticism of the earth, critique of religion into the critique of the rights and critique of theology into politics via smoking the sanctities. The truth reality of Islam and Zoroastrianism is the ethnic domination of Arabs and Persians. The truth of the Iranian and Arabic religion and culture is the power tool and the relations of the ethnic domination of Arabs and Pars.

The development of the theocratic Arabic/Islamic and Iranian/Zoroastrian governments was rooted in violence and military conflict. With the aim of leading the world towards the religion of the right and the battle with followers of the other religions, the religions of Islam and Zoroaster aimed at conquering the world; thus, they turned into empires. However, the religion of the Medes/Kurds did not mean to conquer and lead the world, but it means social contract which became the foundation for the formation of the Kurdish government that is not based on hierarchy and conquest but it is founded on consent, agreement and repelling the foreign invasion. Despite this, the religions of Islam and Zoroastrianism prepared the basis for the establishment of the hierarchical, authoritarian and conquering governments through sanctifying the power and the rulers ( the divine glory, obey Allah and its ...) and anathematizing the political opponents (kill with tomahawk (halberd, do Jihad in the course of Allah and ...).

After the domination acquired with the military power and the ethnic prejudice, the government and religion and law became the control tool of the domination. In fact , Iranian and Arabic politics was the continuation of war and ethnic violence, and their whole laws, religion, culture are the internalization of the ethnic/class violence of the ruling Persian / Arabic. The foundation of the government, and the Iranian/Arabic religion, culture, and rights

are the production force to plunder others' capital and conquer their land, which legalized in the form of Zakat, Jizia, and tax, while the foundation of the Mede/Kurd government was not based on looting, but it was its own preservation from being looted and its nature was the social contract.

Unlike Iran / Arab, the intention behind the formation of the Mede government was not the plunder / conquest but justice and defense; hence, they did not need a strong military empire and celestial totalitarian ideology. Thus, unlike Iran / Arab governments which turned into the class and military empires, the logical result of the Median/Kurdish government was an anticlass and primitive democracy.

Therefore, the results of this study indicate that the government not only in the West but in the Middle East ( Iran / Arab ) is neither the re-placement of God, nor the natural phenomenon nor the representative of the general interests, but the reproduction or the dominion instrument of the production force of the superior group owner. The group owning the production force, the ethnicity/tribe is Arab/Pers and the production force is not labor and capital, but looting and plundering (trophy (spoil), Zakat, taxes and ...) of the others who Zoroaster and Islam gave legitimacy to them. The dominant Arab/Ghuraish and Pers/Achamanid tribe /ethnicity turned into the superior class and the multi-ethnic empire aristocracy and the top of the pyramid of the new government as the result of plundering the defeated tribes; hence, the defeated ethnic groups changed into the inferior tribe and they were placed at the bottom of the hierarchy. They transformed the government and the tribal militia to the hierarchical government and the institutionalized military power, i.e. the empire / caliphate with the foundation cement of Islam/Zoroastrianism to maintain hegemony, to continue looting and to prevent the uprising of the vanquished and defeated tribes, who became the lower class and the slave of the new system.

Therefore, the foundation of the body of Persian / Arabic civilization, was the interests of the belly /hypogastric and plunder / conquest; the empire / caliphate was its executive arm and religion (Islam and Zoroastrianism) was its hegemonic tool and its legitimacy ideology. If there were not the conquering and legitimacy-giving religions of Islam and Zoroaster, the Arab / Iranian governments would not easily be capable of expansionism or at least they would lack the necessary legitimacy in conquest. Essentially, they were the religions of Zoroastrianism and Islam that led to the unity of Persians and Arabs under one banner and caused attacking the other ethnic groups. Since the Kurds had been defeated and condemned in the history, they had not been the ruling and victorious race, and as we noted, due to the looting of their capitals, the defeated ethnic group would have turned into the inferior group. Therefore, the Kurds from Gaumates, Mazdak and Khoramdinan up to this day were doomed to fight in the communist form. The dominant governments have imposed this sort and form of campaign on us because of their invasions and changing into the upper class. The style and form of fighting of the Kurds are communistic, but it is not their ideal form. The aim is the same ethnic struggle and it is the same political issue of us and the other. The form of the communist struggle is the only the means of restoring ethnic freedom and reclaiming ethnic sources, which unfortunately today, has dominated the shape and method of conquest and the national / ethnic struggle for

communist and international fantasies. The Kurds have turned into the lower class and they are forced to fight in the communist form because of the looting of their surplus capitals but their main ideal and the end of their struggle is the same ethnic lib-eration. In contrast to the Kurds' defense of the communist struggle and ideology, the dominant tribes on Kurds (Iran / Arab) have defended justice in its ancient meaning, that is, equality and the maintenance of the social/class hierarchy in the world of thought. Moreover, because of the leisure gained from becoming the superior class, they have produced the thought and religion to facilitate the gear of power and not knowledge. In contrast, as the lower class of Kurd has become the slave and it has given much of its time to earn something and to work with the hand, it has not any have any free time to produce the thought. For the same reason, the struggle of the lower ethnic group/class of the Kurd with the upper Pers/Arab ethnic group/class has been the battle against the whole civilization, as the elements of civilization, such as law and rule, and culture are the internalization and subtlization of the Pers/Arab ethnic dominance, and their policies are the continuation of their war and ethnic domination. The religion and government are the military instruments and ethnic dominance of the two top Arab/ Per-sians ethnicities, respectively.

The identity foundation of the Kurdish society is Mithraism. Noneth-less, the sort of Mithraism not in the meaning of religion and worship but in the meaning of consensus and agreement. The contract enters Mithra from the annihilation of abstraction to the existence of society. The contract and agreement preceded the goodness and badness and it is the basis for the diagnosis the goodness from badness and the right-ness from the wrongness. There is no pre - determined and sacred goodness and badness before consent and agreement. The politics must also be based on dialogue and -in the words of Habermas- on the com-municative rationality in which the truth is the same consensus and agreement rooted in and based on ideal policy, that is, agreement and dialogue not domination and elimination. It means the participation of all groups, thoughts, discussions, and their final agreement, which Mith-raism seems to be an appropriate identity foundation for this work. The hypothesis of this study does not mean the suppression or rejection of Islamic groups in the political issue and Kurdish government but it de-notes that they must not defend any predetermined principles and rights in the world of politics. The principles and nature of the government are defined by all social groups, not the predetermined metaphysical de-crees. The principle in the kurdish political affair is the national / ethnic interests based on internal concord and the fight against the others. Un-fortunately, Kurdish parties, that are reproduction of tribalism, talk more about animosity among themselves and friendship and contract with the others. Federalism is derived from the Latin word "foedus" meaning treaty, contract and agreement which is the indirect translation of the same Mithra. However, the contract was set among the Median tribes themselves against Assyrians. While Kurdish parties, instead of agreeing and applying the federalism among themselves, speak of the enmity towards each other and the federalism and agreement with the Assyrian of the current time. This policy is a disruption of the Kurdish political identity and talking of federalism and agreement with the rul-ing governments on Kurds is similar to this matter that the Median tribes might have united with the Assyrians and they might have chosen an Assyrian as their leader. Nevertheless, the basis of federalism was the choice of a Mede called Diako as the king not going under the royal power of the others. Besides, Hokhshatra means being the king on one-self (Hints, 1386: 55).

Before the formation of the Medes rule, the kurds, like the Persians and the Arabs, were divided into scattered and pluralistic tribes, and each was under the domination of other tribes, especially Assyrians. Apparently, both the Kurds/Medes, the Persians/Iranians and the Arabs managed to form a government beyond the extension of tribes with the difference that the Median sovereignty was pluralistic without eliminating the multiplicity of the tribes. It was the unity in multiplicity and more like the agreement with tribal elders and participation in the power system. However, the sovereignty of the Arabs and Persians was not unity in multiplicity but the domination of unity over multiplicity and regularity in dispersion, not founded on the basis of agreement but through the establishment of despotism, hierarchy, and the elimination of plurals. They digested the multiple gods in a unique God, i.e. Allah/Ahormazd which indicates the digestion and deletion of multiple powers in a unit-ed power. The Iranian / Arabic unity was achieved by domination and elimination of opponents and rivals, but the Medes unity that was not the unity in reality but it was agreement causing the development of pluralities. This is quite evident from the name of "Hegmataneh" which means the agreement and the place of the community (Girishman, 1388: 116) and "Hakhamanish" that means the union (Hints, 1386: 55). The difference between the two terms of union and consensus is as much as the difference between two systems of the Medes and the Persians. In Islam, as well as the Persians, unity is the main concept. Part of the reason beyond this is rooted in the desire and motivation of government formation. As the aim of the establishment of the government in the Arabs and Persia was the encroaching and plundering of others, it required a centralized government and a strict hierarchy of discipline that could defeat the others and conquer their lands, but the Medes did not aim at grasping and plundering, but carrying out justice and repelling the invasion. Thus, the Medes did not need the hierarchy and despotic centralization.

The pattern of Iranian wisdom and the other of it:

Searching in the pre - Islamic historical thought of Iran provides a more comprehensive pattern of political wisdom in governing. Undoubtedly, the advent of prophecy of Zoroaster as the main event in ancient Iran affected all elements of the Iranian world. Although, prior to Zoroaster, the Mazda was one of the Aryan gods, but it was due to the teachings of Zoroastrianism that he found reverence and glory as the complete goodness versus Demon as the absolute evil. The cosmic battle of Ahormazd with Demon is the end and the target of the life of the Mazdaian human (Rad, vol30: 140). The concept that is immediately embodied in the mind is the presence of an organized world versus an un-organized one in which the organized world is described as the concept of "Asha". In the political history of the Greater Iran, Asha has been used as a model to explain and justify the political system of Iranshahr: anything that undermines this order is despicable and unholy. The fundamentals of the political thought of IranShahr consist of utopia, ideal King (Shah) and social triple structure (class structure). The ideal king is supervising the performance of the cosmic order on the earth, which is transformed into utopian aspirations as the result of performing it correctly. All that causes the disruption and modification of these bases is considered as the ill-religion (the same). Chapter 33 of the Iranian version of Bandhesh speaks of detriments hurting Iranshahr each millennium: "The first millennium initiated with Demon's attack on Kayomars, the bull, and Mashi and

Mashianah ... the second millennium with Azhidahak's attack on Jamshid up to the victory of Feraydon, ... the third millennium with the assault of Afrasiab and the killing of Nozar, who repelled Manoochehr attack and looted Iranshahr so that Kaykhosrao triumphed over Afrasiab again and Zoroaster emerged". The other and the disrupter of the Iranian order has been- in accordance with the texts of Avesta- the Kurdish riots . Demon, Azhidahak, and Toranian – as we stated before- were Kurds. Zoroaster was not historically prior to Demon (Ahriman)/Ahura, and the Toranians but he was the constructor of this double contrasts and the concepts of Demon (Ahriman) and evil but he should not be located before Ahura Mazda in the Zoroastrian myths.

The revolution is a heresy in any form in the Mazdaian political wisdom because it leads to the disruption in cosmic order and community regulation. For this reason, the Mazdak revolution in the view of Zoroastrian formal literature was seen as the follower of the tradition of Demon (Ahriman)'s attack on the universe and as the pollution of the- divine cosmic order (Rad, the same: 141). Thus, Feridon turned against Azhidahak, Darius against Gaumates, and Anoshirvan against the revolt of Mazdak so as to revive the lost dignity of the cosmic order or the same despotism or the class structure. The Battle of Darius, Gaumates, Anoshirvan and Mazdak, from the viewpoint of the Zoroastrian formal literature, is a reminder of the battle of Feridon and Zahak, Ordibahasht and Indra, and more original than these the cosmic conflict of Ahormazd with Demon, and in general it was the conflict of goodness with evil (the same: 142). According to the theoretical framework we have presented regarding the relation of truth and power, it is clear that Asha and cosmic order are the tools of politics and the relations of Persian power, and the Demon or evil and Zahak are the Median political opponents.

Zoroaster regarded Mithra as Demon, Cyrus considered Astiag as the Dragon, Darius saw Gaumates as the lying, and Anoshirvan regarded Mazdak as Ashmogh which has got its meaning in relation with the word Asha denoting as the disruptor of Asha's order and the truth. Ashmogh is comprehensible meaning a large array of the rioters and the disruptors of the truth order. It has come in the Pahlavi texts: "Hormozd told Zoroaster the way is One and all other ways are astrays" (the same: 143). Therefore, what is known as the Greater Iran and the history of its civilization is the same royal concepts of utopia/God's charisma, class justice, the religious culture of both Zoroaster and after Islam, that is, the metaphysical legitimacy, and what is known as Demon, Azhidahak, Ashmogh, and falsehood are the disruptors of the holiness of the kingdom order in the direction of tribal democracy. They have also been the disruptors of the class justice in the course of justice equality, the disruptors of the religious culture in the direction of the salvation of the individuals' lives, and the disruptors of the heavenly legitimacy in line with the popular legitimacy. The basis of war and conflict with evil from Ahormazd and Ahriman (Demon) to Anoshirvan and Mazdakids has been the struggle of Iranism with the Kurdistan. The conflict of Iran-ism with Kurdistan, on one hand, is the war and political struggle between the two different peoples. On the other hand, it is the conflict between two perspectives and two approaches to man and world; it is the struggle of divine legitimacy with public acceptance or social contract, the struggle of monarchy despotism with tribal democracy, the struggle of Platonic justice with equality justice, the struggle of the Apollonian/religious with the culture or anti - religious culture of Dionysism, which are even

reproduced today. Zahak, the brain-eater have changed into the head-cutter Kurd and the agent of Ahriman (evil) to the agent of imperialism and ...

### The confiscation of the Median Cultures

The Iranians retained the whole of the Medes concepts, but they changed its temporal meaning completely and gave a spiritual / meta-physical concept to it. The concepts of Divine charisma, Fra Washi (great pleasure), God/ god, and ... are Median/Mithraism concepts but their meaning has been completely reversed. For instance, Mithra, which had the meaning of contract and the god of the cave darkness, in Iran acquired the meaning of obedience and sun. The Mehraba (tavern) in which the dance, the song, the music, the singing, the collective song, the winedrink and debauchery was held changed into Khor + Abad and later Kharabat meaning the house of the sun and the place for the worship and self-austerity<sup>1</sup>. All these mean that they preserved the appearance of the Mithra's name but they reversed its meaning completely. Mithra, which meant the garden / campus, and the place of joy and dance in the Mede, took the meaning of Bagh/ god, and the place of worship in Iran. Zamyad Yasht Farah, Yasht19, which was an old Yasht and Pre-Zoroastrian meant the goddess of the earth became totally celestial via the latter Zoroastrian additions and it is about the divine charisma "There are words about the mountain in the first section of the Zamyad Yash, and in the rest of the story, there are mentions regarding the belonging of the mountain to the natural ground and the belonging of Fera (charisma) to the mythical mountain without having any relation to the Kianian Fera (charisma) fertility ..." (Safa, 1384, 116). The origin of Zamyad Yasht has been about the earth and the mountain but its meaning has artificially changed into the topics of Fera Izadi (divine charisma), heaven, and ... through foisting the later Zoroastrian form over it. The word "Ferah Izadi" itself is Kurdish, Ferah means a lot and numerous and Washi means happiness which means much happiness or various kinds of happiness in Hawari Kurdish. Fera Izadi meant the abounding of the gods in the Mede, but it acquired a celestial meaning of the god or the symbol of the god later on much like the words Pardis and Bagh which were the terrestrial words in the Mede but they acquired celestial meaning in Iranian culture. The divine Farah is the same as the abounding of the kings or the rulers (Amirs) which is the pre-ground for the concept of Shahanshi (monarchy). As Banonist has said, Khashysia or the monarchy either has the meaning of land and power, i.e. the power of the Shah or the sovereignty of the king resulting from the popular legitimacy, not the divine legitimacy; thus, the people are the creators of the king and the legitimacy-givers of his power, which in Iran, Izad (god) rose to the sky and became the legitimacy-bestower or the conferrer of the power and the creator of the land.

Arabic word "Khalgh" is derived from the term "Khalk" (people) in Kurdish, that is, the people were legitimacy-givers and the creators of the power of the king. This is the same legitimacy and choice of the king in the form of Mitra / contract, and people are the creator of god / king, but in Iran, the King / God went to heaven and it was transformed from the legitimacy-taker from the people into the creator of the people and the legitimacy-giver to the powers. In every place of Yasht<sup>10</sup> which is one of the old Yashts, there are some hints remaining no doubts about



the oldness of these texts in which Mithra has been introduced as the greatest God and there is no news of Ahormazd, there has come only the word “Dami – Datem meaning the creator which is a nickname given to Ahormazd in Vandidad (Razi, 1381: 63). Mithra means the created and the creator indicating the artificiality of the political order and the priority of the Mithra/contract of the people over the political order, the right and the law. Mithra is the same agreement of Khalk / people, but the earthly creator / contract Mithra was confiscated and was given to Ahormazd and Allah but in a different meaning. It was given to a creator which existed before the people and political order and the people and political order should organize themselves in con-formation to him and not all the people, but only the elite like Zoroaster and Mohammad have access to him. While, the creator Mithra is nei-ther beyond nor prior to the people but the Contract is the people them-selves and the people preceded the political order and they wer not nei-ther the tools, nor the substance of the political order; therefore, the people are the Creator of the political order and the determiners of the quality and laws of the government. When the Khalk (people) took the creation of the people up to the heaven, the political order was no longer the result of the consensus of the people but the result of the creation of divine will and the paradise is not the earthly paradise of the Mede but the godly heaven in the sky where only the obedient people of the di-vine / royal political order will enter. It is clear that the root of all the ascension to the sky metaphysical beings is the lack of public ac-ceptance, so they force people to obey through the divine instruments and celestial heaven. Farhang (culture) in today’s Persian is rooted in the Median language; Far is the same as Fera (very) in Kurdish and Hang is similar to the Hag as a derivation of the word Hagmataneh meaning contract or the same Mithra since Hagmataneh is derived from two words Hag or Hang meaning very and Matan is the same the Medes. Therefore, the placeof the Medes agreement, i.e. Hagmatana and FarHang (culture) means the consensus of all the people and popu-lation while the Persians confiscated the surface of the word and con-verted its meaning and transformed it into Fara meaning the charismatic or glorious sign as only the kings had the divine charisma and the gen-eral folks or public were assumed as lacking any charismatic glory, that is, they vacated the meaning of Fara from its earthly/Mithraism meaning and gave it a divine/ celestial meaning. According to the changes of the words, Farhang (culture) may also has been Farah Sang or Fara San as Mihr became Mithr. San has meant the ruler and the king up to several decades ago and it even today; hence, the Fara San has perhaps meant multiple kings. Besides, Yarsan, which along with Izadism are among the few remaining rituals of the ancient Kurdish Mithraism, is likely to be driven from the same word. Yarsan means the companions or the friends of the king and even in the Yarsani book of “Saranjam”, it is written San Zohak instead of the king of Soltan Isaac. Thus, Yarsan means the friends of the king, that is, Soltan Zohak. In fact San means Izad (god) and Izadi and yarsan have the same meaning as we stated that Izad meant the rule or the cheiftsman (Mir) in the Mede and Mir is rooted in the word “Mehr” meaning the ruler/the king that has ascened to the power through contract/Mithra. Furthermore, Khalk/people are the creators of the king which its meaning has been reversed in Iranian culture; the king is the pillar between the earth and the sky and he ac-quires its legitimacy not from the people and contract but from the God. Khoda (God) is a Median concept; Xwaday means a powerful self that is derived from the self or the individual and it lacks any metaphysical meaning which changed into the absolute God in the culture of Iran. Yarsan has the same meaning as Pir-e Shalyar. Pir-e Shalyar is a cere-mony which is held in Hawraman every year in which they perform the cow-killing ceremony.

Shalyar, that is, Shahriyar is the same as Xshaisa which we stated its meaning. The Yar (companion or friend) of Shalyar is the same Yar of the Shah (king) or Yarsan. Farhang that denoted an earthly meaning of collective contract and communicative rationality became as the symbol and sign of the God's messenger. Thus, there has existed no God in the metaphysical meaning of the creator of heaven and earth in the Mede. God has been a Median concept conveying the meaning of the Mir (rul-er)/ king and he has been created by the people/contract. The Persian / historical metaphysical culture confiscated the word of god / bagh, and gave it to the God . It means that God / Shah, or the political order that was created by the people in Mede, became the creator of the people and political order, and rose up to the sky, that was why the Median earthly paradise went up to the sky, too. In the absence of popular acceptance, the Persians presented god to the sky and introduced them-selves as his representative to fill the lack of land acceptance with heav-enly legitimacy. In Iranian/historical culture, the axial period of political order was not the result of the people 's contract, but it was in the continuation of divine cosmic order in which not the masses, but only the kings and king philosophers had the ability to communicate with God and eventually to realize true political order.

Regardless of the content changes of the meanings of the words, Ori-entalists have rendered this verdict that the Mede and the Pers have been co-cultural, co-religious and even the monarchy system in Pers was the continuation of such a system in the Mede because they have found the roots of many Iranian terms in the Mede like Xshaisa. This also shows that most of the so-called Iranian language, concepts and culture have been Median in original but the Persians have expropriated them and have given Zoroastrian/metaphysical meaning to them. Moreover, this hypothesis can be posed that not only its concepts but the totality of the Persian language has been the escheating of the Kurdish language through adding up some letters to the Kurdish words, for example Das (hand), Mas (drunk), Ba (wind), and ... in Kurdish become Dast (hand), Mast (drunk), Bad (wind), and ... in Persian. Ancient Persian inscriptions are mixed with alien elements, there are many words that reveal their non - Iranian identity ... a number of words do not have reliable Indo-European roots ... but in the meantime, the main influence of the alien element is of the Median dialect, there are some distinction between them whether in terms of phonetics, lexical or different grammatical forms" (Kent, 1384: 62).

## The Development of History and the Historical Ethnic Groups in Contrast to the Kurds Chapter Seven

### The Contradiction of the Greece/Sami Wisdom with the Kurd/Mithra

This is not merely Iranian intellect and Zarathustra, which was developed in contrast to and in rejection of the ritual of Mithra. Moreover, it is also the basis of Plato's philosophy and the political wisdom of Semitic / Arabic (Mesopotamia), Armanian, and even Jewish and Christianity and they have been evolved in negation to Mithra and in its continuation at the same time. In fact, three initiator cultures of history, Greece, Semitic, and Iranian developed in contrast with the Median Mithra and in making it as "the other". Even Christianity and the contemporary researchers also did not disgrace Mehr/Mithra. The religions of the East and the West were deep under the influence of Mithraism; the East and the West researchers have always made every effort to cover the truth of Mithraism and destroy its traces ... whatsoever the life of Mithra has been, it has been removed through the endeavours of Christianity in the West and the neo-Zoroastrianism in the East. The British scholar M Robinson says: "In the new edition of the Britanica Encyclopedia, there has not been written more than half of a page about Mithra ... there has been so many traces of Mehr in the beginning century of Christianity yet there is no knowledge of this religion one thousand years following Christianity ... even the archaeologists in the 16th century saw great monuments of Mithraism as the emblems of the gods and heroes of Roman legends" ( Moghadam, 1380: 2 & 97). On the one hand, Moghadam has indicated the negation and disgrace towards mehr/Mithra and he has pointed to the influence of Mithraism on all the religions in the East and West, on the other hand. Mithra is the real thing that the symbolic order of history and religions has been formed based on its negation. It is an actual issue that has not undergone the symbolic order of history / metaphysics, but the symbolic order of history has been developed based on its negation. It is the real thing that does not exist in appearance, but the being of history has emerged in its negation. We can risk presenting this hypothesis that the beginning of the history and the "pivotal period" of history via characters like Plato and Zoroaster and ...have evolved in negation of the Medes/Mithra and making it as "the other". Therefore, 'the other' of the history is the Kurd/Mithra that will be discussed in the next chapter. We now turn to "the other" or "the non" of two major initiating ethnicities of the history, Semitic/ Greek and the major religions to generalize the hypothesis of the confrontation and hostility of Iranian political wisdom against the other historical tribes, and in the next chapter we will address the General theory of the confrontation of history with the Kurd.

### Greek Reason : Apollo / Dionysus

Greek civilization in its unparalleled prosperity in the eighteenth century was a world based on masculine intelligence, order, law, and morality. The principles of the philosophy of three great philosophers are essentially reason, morality, and the sacrifice of feelings at the feet of logic.

The Gods of Homer's works are the Gods of the victorious the aristo-crats, not the popular gods (Russell, 42). The world of Homer was based on law, order, morality, and the aristocratic/cosmic hierarchy. The Homeric world – according to Winckelmann - had a sublime simplicity and peaceful glory before the arrival of Dionysus/ Zagros. Then there came a deep crisis in the religious life and culture of Greek, threatening all the Homeric conceptions and visions towards complete destruction. It seems that the simplicity and quietness of the gods of Olympe suddenly disappeared. Zeus and the God of Brightness and Apollo the God of the Sun did not have the ability to resist the evil forces that appeared in worshipping the Dionysus and to drive them out" (Cassirer 1377: 111). Dionysus was another name of Zagros. Dionysus has no place among the gods of Olympus in Homer's poems, he entered as a stranger and a latecomer, and is more likely to have roots in the Asian faiths" (Cassirer 1377:111). It is hard to find the special characteristics of the Greek ge-nius, what appears here is the fundamental sense of mankind (Cassirer, the same). The Greek creed or religion was based on rationalism and abstract concepts, and it was not in compromise with emotions, drunk-enness, and Dionysus dance."

"The existing morality in Greece did not bear the emergence of passion-ate instincts, but the inner feelings that caused the morality and the sense of being reasonable to appear as a burden in Greece provided the background for the acceptance of the ardent Dionysus creed. Thus, became natural for the Dionysus ritual to face with the public acceptance despite all oppositions in Greece (Russell, the same: 48). Especially this cult (Dionysus/Bakos) was the advocate of women's rights and the women flocked across the hills to dance with their body naked (the same).

"When the wild and frenetic attraction of disciple women of Dionysus culminated, they called on God and told him in supplication: O Dionysus appear, like a one-hundred headed dragon or giant or in the form of a roaring lion that the fire flames spread up from his hands and feet" (Cassirer, the same: 113). This description about Dionysus is the same lion and dragon headed Mithra. Civilization prevents the sensations and desires through providence (foresight), tradition, religion, and ethic, but the worshipper of Dionysus reacts against tradition, ethic and religion. He sees the world as full of happiness and beauty eagerly in the drunk state (Russell, the same: 50). But the Greek religion could not simply return to this primitive feelings. The Greek mind was a completely logical mind (Cassirer, the same: 112). The Greek civilization like the Iranian civilization, that was not able to exclude and dispel Dionysus/Mithra, had no remedy except to accept it but in a changed form. The Greek mind could not accept the nonwisest elements of Dionysus ritual without a sort of theoretical explication (Cassirer, the same) since nothing must not stay out of the domain of the wisdom as whatsoever gets out-side of the wisdom territory is the main source of the fear' (Horkheimer, 50). Orpheus prolocutors presented this mission. "They changed the Dionysus ritual, that was one of the merely rawest and the wisest rites and ceremonies in origin, into a system. Orpheus theology created the Dionysus/Zagros which they made Zeus as the father and Semla as his father. In Orpheus theology, they no longer considered attraction as the mere madness but as the hieromani or the sacred madness in which the soul leaves off the body and flies towards the unity with God ... and the human sacrifices his own individuality and returns to the eternal unity of the gods... it neutralize the worldly plurality of the evil resulting from the Titan riots" (Cassirer, the same: 112-114). In Orpheus ritual, the spiritual austerity replaced the ecclesiastical or corporal

drunkenness, Orpheus was first of all a saint and a philosopher whose reforms caused the reactions and fury of the Bakosi women who tore down Orpheus (Russell, the same: 51-52). "Orpheosians were an auster cult. The wine was a code in their viewpoint as it became so in the principles of the Christianity. The kind of being that Orpheusians were after was charisma and becoming one with God, they were after the element of the mystical episteme which entered the Greek philosophy by Pythagoras in the same way that Orpheus was the reformer of the Dionysian rite. The element of the Orpheusian entered the Plato philosophy by Pythagoras and it penetrated most part of the religious philosophy after Plato" (Russell, the same: 55-56).

Therefore, the same plight, that the Zoroastrianism caused it to the Mithraism rituals of contract, dance, and rapture so that they changed its meaning into the mystical sunworshipping, was repeated in Greek civilization in a way that it was manipulated after entering into the Greek civilization and there developed a mystical/austerity interpretation from it. The whole Greek Platonic philosophy was transformed into mysticism and its fleshly sensations changed into spiritual rapture and it served as an instrument to ascend the religion and philosophy spiritually. These transformations occurred in the same way that the Zoroastrianism and Mages did to Mithraism in Iran Islam and rose it to the level mysticism and spirituality. It was also transformed from the bodily or corporal drunkenness into the spiritual rapture and from sensation into logic. As there have remained some traces of Mithraism and its terrestrialism and tragic identity in Shahname of Ferdawsi, but with Iranian/Zoroastrian color and cover, there have existed some aspects and impacts of Mithraism in the Greek culture, too. "One of the lasting elements of Dionysus in Greece was its womanly aspect which had significance in Pythagoras philosophy and it affected the Greek philosophy ... in such a way that Plato claimed the equality of the woman and man rights ... Greek tragedy has its roots in the rites of Dionysus ritual particularly Oripides revered Dionysus and Erose and disliked the polite and proud human being. Human being gets mad or faces sorrow in his tragedies as the result of the Gods' fury" (Russell, the same:55-56). The tragedy and the Dionysus dance that Nietzsche was smouldering in its losing by Socrates had the roots in Mithraism and among the Kurds.

#### Plato and Mithra

Plato has described his theory of knowledge by the well-known illustration of the Cave Theory, that the ascension of the mind from the dark point of the cave to the entrance of the cave, where it is the radiation spot of the sunlight, is the sign of the development of epistemology. "The prisoners of the cave, who are in the darkest corner of the cave, far away from the sunlight, which are representative of the majority of human beings in Plato's view, see only the shadows of the reality, not the reality itself. Their views on the world are very imperfect, and owing to their own and the others passions and prejudices, they are distorted and gone astray. If they are forced to see the truth, they are blinded by the too much brightness of the light. They consider the shadows on the wall of the cave as more real than the facts. Plato knows the image of the shadows on the wall of the cave as the world of bigotry, the passions and sophistry and the transition from the darkness of the cave towards the brightness of the fire and light as the world of intelligibilities and the truth, and the flaring world of the sunlight as the representatives of sensible facts" (Kaplestone, vol1, 88, 190 - 191). Plato, also in the book of 'Republic', in which he defines the non-good man, he describes it as similar to the head of the lion or the dragon around it. He regards the evil as responsible for the growth of dragon-

like character giant and the head of the lion in man (Plato, the Republic, 590). In fact, two "nons" in the philosophical apparatus of Plato, the darkness of the cave and the lion-headed man and the drag-on. Are these symbols the logical conclusion of Plato's personal creativity, or do they have their roots in a particular culture and creed?

As we have already stated, Mithraists performed their rituals, dances and festivities inside the darkness of the cave, far from the sunlight, and the Mithraism symbols that were discovered around the world have shown "Mithra" as the lion-headed man with a dragon around it. On the other hand, the two main symbols of Mithraism, i.e. the darkness of the cave and being far away from the sunlight, and sanctifying the animals such as snakes, Scorpio, ravens, and lions, which are the symbol of evil in all metaphysical cultures, and killing them has religious rewards. The two main symbols of Mithraism are precisely the two "nons" and contrasts of Plato's philosophy.

Plato sees the cave as a symbol of ignorance, passions, and the asses of the illiterate people and he regards the lion-headed and the dragon creature as a symbol of human neglect and the ignorant and licentious man who is far away from prosperity. The Cave, the snake, and the Lion of Mithra becomes the symbols of Demon, Dave and Ajidahak in Zoroastrianism and they turn into the symbol of ignorance and the evil part of the human soul.

We have already stated that the genuine prior Mithra, with the head of the lion and the snake encircling it, had nothing to do with the religious culture of Iran, but it became the devil of the Persians. In support of this fact that the Greek culture, not only has nothing to do with Mithra and even Mithra is "the non" of their culture, we can refer to Plato, who is a symbol of the Greek culture. Plato sees the balance between good and evil as the basis of his definition of the human / good citizen. He knew the transition over this balance, commitment of evil and sin as the cause of the growth of the dragon-tempered monster, and the dragon-tempered lion as a symbol of evil and sin in us (The Republic of Plato, 590, quoting Hansman, Kloska, the same: 259). He considers the snake and lion as the symbol of the evil part of the human soul and the satanic temptations. These matters are important when - according to Benonist - the students of Plato regarded Zoroaster as the leader of Plato or Plato as the re-realization of Zoroaster (Hansman, the same, 264 - 266). Plato himself names Zoroaster with a special respect and his Dualism is influenced by Zoroaster (Saghib, Kloska, the same: 259). THUS, like Zoroaster, Plato also knows the evil dimension of the non-good man as Mithra. We have already mentioned that the lion and the snake are not the symbols of evil and filthiness, but they are the signs of goodness. This is attributed to the differences between the Iranian / Greek / Sami ontological perspective, from one side - which calls the Lion and the snake as filthy- and Kurdish / Mithism view, on the other hand, which sees the lion and the serpent as the true human symbols, not the symbols of the filthy human beings. In the metaphysical cultures of Greek / Persian / Sami, the emphasis is on the spirit, spirituality, the other world and God, and they consider the body and instincts as the human liberation cage and the symbols of the dirty aspect of the human being. However, there did not exist any beliefs in the soul, the world after and spirituality among the Kurds. They have known the basis of the human being as his same flesh and instincts in this terrestrial world. In all cultures, both cows and eagles are symbols of the soul and the heaven, and the lion and the snake are symbols of the earth and the instincts. For this reason, the earthly / physical Kurds have been badged as snaky-haired Medusa, Ajidahak and Jin, Tokhmai Tiamat (the decents of filthiness) in Greek / Persian and Semitic

spiritual/clerical cultures. Therefore, Komajin culture is neither Greece nor Iranian but Kurdish/Median. There, the king has required the other world and eternity for himself but happiness and salaciousness for the masses of the public.

Shah (king) has ruled from behalf of Iran, so he has had the Iranian culture, but the public have been Kurd Komajin and they have not believed in heaven and ...; hence, the King, according to their culture, has invited them to live happily in this world, and to dance in Dionysus form. The other thing to notice is that Hansman has seen the pictures of the head of the lion with encircling snake ... as influenced by Plato's philosophy, to show the filthy and evil part of the human soul. But it should be noted that in Plato's viewpoint, these pictures are the symbol of the evil part of the human soul. Nonetheless, The symbols of the-Mithraism should be looked at from their own point of view, not the Plato's spiritual / metaphysical philosophy. The human principle, In Mithraism viewpoint- is the body, instinct, and the life of this same world whose symbols are the lion and the snake. The Greek culture was such an intellectual culture with ethical strict rules even before Plato that "by the arrival of the evil forces of the Dionysus ritual - which is the god of dancing and drunkenness and wine-, it developed a deep crisis in the Greek religious life and culture, it destroyed all the Hellenic imaginations, and it removed the Gods of Olympus all of a sudden. Therefore, Zeus, the god of the bright sky, and Apollo, the god of the sun, could not resist in front of the evil forces existing in worshipping Dionysus or Zagros (Cassirer, 1937, 111). This Dionysus that shook the foundation of the Greek culture was the Hellenized of the same Zagrosian Mithra. Thus, the evil becoming of Mithra is Platonic/Greece from the viewpoint of the ethical/ intellectual/metaphysical mentality.

Therefore, these images in the creed of Mithra were not the picture of the evil part of the human soul but the origin of the human being is good who was later described as the symbol of evil in metaphysical / spiritual, the Greek/ Persian culture, and the Kurds were described as Ajidahak, Medusa, and ... . What is described in the culture of Iran and Greece as "evil" is a representation of freedom among the Kurds that have been created by the separation of God from the will and power, and its end is when it reconciled with God totally" (Nikitin, 1937, 457). That is, what in the Greek culture is the sign of evil and the evil part of the human soul is the freedom of will and liberation among the Kurds. Besides, it shows that the salvation among the Kurds / Mithraists means the release of body and flesh, not the salvation of the soul and the prosperity in the hereafter. The only way to get out of the dualism of the body/earth and the soul/heaven is the reconciliation of God with the freedom of will. God must admit the freedom of man's will, not the man that of the God's principles. The man behaves as he pleases, even in eating the fruit of knowledge, God must admit the physical freedom and freedom of the knowledge of the man, and not banish him from heaven. J. Mar and Bartould rightly know the root of the idolatry religions (not the stony idol but being anti-religion / God being and being Erotic, Qaderi) in the world of Islam and Asia Minor as in the indulgence in lewdness among the Kurds (Quoting from Nikitin, the same, 459 – 461). We can observe the objective realization of lewdness (earthly/Erotic being) of the Kurds' culture among the historic movements of Mazdakids and Khoramdinan.

The religious thinkers speak of the procedures of the human soul towards God, and the Platonic and neo-Platonic philosophy speak of the ascent of the soul to the rational world (Cassirer, 1937: 164). In modern philosophy, Kant considered the conflict of instinct (sensuality) and reason / morality as intrinsic- that the moral man must go beyond its existing nature and in fact

undergoes denaturalization (Smith, 1379: 51) and they speak of the ascent of the soul towards morality and rationality. Besides, in Iranian culture, "the soul was first created, and then the body was created for the soul and the body is the instrument of the soul (Pirnia, 1376: 14), in which "the soul should not be forgotten for the sake of the body" (Zener, 1377: 31). But in the religion of Mithra, there was no spirit or soul that would have the ability to climb or fall. The reality and limitations of man are accepted and he does not go after the dreams, the delusion of rationalities, moralities, ethicalities, and ... . The man is the same body, instincts and the sense of corporation and cooperation, and no king, philosophers, priests, divine glory (Farah), utopia, the advancement of history, classless society and ... cannot make the man as the instrument in the name of the illusions of the salvation of the soul, heaven, and ... since the presupposition of all illusions which – in the words of Nietzsche – put the human being on for thousands of years, is the illusion of the soul. Thus, in Mithra/ Kurds, the possibility of any misuse of man is lost, and it does not mean that the metaphysical sense in human being but – as according to Dilthey – the sense of life of an individual and the partial emotional experiences of his life cannot be manifested in any conceptual cognition and the system of scientific / intellectual logic

Therefore, the whole of Plato's philosophy – that the whole of humanity revolves around his thoughts – is turning around based on the negation of symbols and concepts of the Medes Mithraism ritual. Plato could not understand the tragic being and darkness of existence or was not able to comprehend and deal with it by taking refuge in dreams and the illusion of the theory of forms. But he accepted the tragic reality of being kindly and with the dance of Dionysus, and he began dancing and satisfying his passions and becoming existence in the dark caves far away from the sun. But Plato and Zarathustra, in escaping from the tragic reality, took refuge in the illusion of theory of forms and the sun. Plato and Zarathustra removed the theory of forms and Ahura Mazda through the prayer of delusion unaware that life is on earth, not heaven. Thus, we can consider this statement of Nietzsche that: "Plato has been the enemy of this world and the human life by building a transcendental universe according to its pre-moral standards ..." (Nietzsche quoting Ka-pileston, 88, vol.1: 237) as correct about Zoroaster and the whole meta-physical life of the human being, which developed in contrast to Mithra/Kurd. Furthermore, Plato posed the theory of eternal and unchanging rules in contrast to the theory of the social contract of the Sophists in Greece which its origins is traced back to Mithra.

It is not just the "non" of the philosophical apparatus of Plato which was founded in hostility to the Medes and Mithra, but also in Greek mythology – we will discuss it more in the following – the Persians are characterized as sacred Perseus and the Medes as the Dragon-like Medusas which lives in the dark World. If Plato did not have an understanding of the contractual freedom and celebration of happiness in the Medes cave, he was essentially incapable of planning his philosophy. A question and crisis that flew the Minerva owl of Plato was the manners and customs of Kurdish Mithra. If the whole history of philosophy is a handful of thoughts that revolves around Plato, the whole Plato, and hence the philosophy is a form of wonder and reaction to the living life of Mithra, which in opposition to the philosophy of enmity with the human life of Plato, Mithra himself is the philosophy of life.



## Perseus and Medusa

The Greeks regarded the Persians and the Medes as the manifestation and the symbol of these two mythical characters of themselves. Medusa and Perseus are two of legendary characters of Greek mythology which had relations with the Orient and they have said that "Medea" traveled to the Mede and Perseus was the ancestor of the Achamanids" (Cook, 1383: 19-20). Xezephon regarded Cyrus the son of Cambodia and the King of the Persia as from the race of Perseus, that is, from the decent of Perseus, the famous hero of Greek (Shahbazi, Bitá: 96). If we look at the pictures of medusa in Greek mythology, we find that it is very similar to the icon of Shahmaran (snakes king), a myth that is prevalent among the Kurds. A head similar to the human head, but the body of both of them is in the shape of snakes, while both Shahmaran and Medusa are female.

A number of classical scholars interpreted the legend of Medusa as a quasi - historical, echoing a true historical attack (Robert, 1955, 17). This real attack can be a reflection of the Persia attack on the Mede. In the eyes of the Roman poet, Ovid, Medusa was in fact a beautiful woman who aroused the jealousy of many of her suitors, but after being raped by Athena, the sea god, her beautiful hair turned into the snake and her face became terrible (Philip, 30). The Medusa's image becoming ugly is the reconstruction of her "the others" similar to Peri-ka who was so beautiful and sexually attractive but she was transformed into the Dave and ugly fairy after the Persians domination. Becoming ugly after the Athena raping her can be a symbol of the Medes' becoming brutal after the Persians invaded their soil.

In this myth, the salvation of Eragon's city hinges upon the capture of Medusa's head, one of Gurgones, the Gurgones were three monsters whose heads were snakes, two of whom were immortal and the third Gurgon who was called Medusa was mortal and vulnerable (Bern, 1375, 86). Medusa, who could turn the audience to stone with her looking was beheaded by Perseus (Bullfinch, 2007: 9). Perseus who was a man was able to behead Medusa with the guidance of Hermes and with the help of a sickle- like card, and the bronze mirror that the god of Athena gave him.

First of all, Perseus is a man, he is the son of Zeus, who owns the divine charisma, because he becomes victorious with the help of the Zeus' sword, Hermes' knife, Athena's mirror and ... . But Medusa is a woman, not like Perseus, she was not born from celestial Zeus, but she resides in the underground and dark world (Hades). Her hair is made of the snake and her body is dragon. While Perseus goes back to Eragon with the help of the eagle, the eagle also ate the Peremeota liver every day. Therefore, Perseus is the symbol of heaven, light, eagle, gods, Hermes and ... and Medusa is the symbol of dragons, earth, darkness, demons and ... . In other words, the victory of Perseus over Medusa is the victory of class structure or cosmic order on the structure of equality and ground order, it is the triumph of divine logos over human intellect.

In the world of philosophy, the eagle is a symbol of divine and meta-physical thought and the snake and dragon are the symbols of the earthly thoughts and wisdom. When Nietzsche says, "I saw an eagle and a snake like two friends", in fact he (Nietzsche) wants to break down the foundation of dualism (the earth sky). Therefore, like the Prometheus, the earthly / instinctive concept and the rebellion being of the Kurds is obvious and heavenly/religious and obedient being of the Persians is clear. The snake-haired Medusa is the same as snake-shoulder Zahak.

The myth of Medea and Yason also contains the concepts which are derived from the Mede. Medea is a agentive intention which does not undergo any symbolic and descriptive order and distills the mental-ty/culture as the result of her husband being married to the king's daughter of Kereon through the betrayal of Yason. Medea is the contradiction of Ulysses. As we said before, Ulysses made the con-strained metaphysical reason dominant, and created a gap between reason and the instinctive life of the man against the song of Sirons and the call of the human life. Mede a is the same as the Sirons whom Olysse does not want his companions to go under her influence via turning their deaf ear to her. Medea attracts the subjects in her favor. Medea is prior to the metaphysical subject and prior to the in-stinct/reason dualism.

### The Greek tragedy and Kurdish Mithra

As we noted above, according to Russell, the Greek tragedy originated from Dionysus/Mithra. Tragedy is the lament of the soul outlying from the Mithraism paradise, as the Plato's theory of the forms and Zarathustra's paradise and Asha are the held-on and faraway resident place of Mithra. The philosophy and religion constructed divine (god-ly) reason, the theory of form, and heavenly paradise in contrast to sexual concord, earthly reason, and heaven / paradise of the Medes, while they negated the freedom culture of the Medes, they took the chagrin (yearning) of not having that culture to the heavenly paradise. Zizek writes that racism is a reaction to a lack and yearning of sexual desire. If we consider the sexual freedom of Mithra, which was based on mutual consent and agreement without any preconceived notions, and if we consider its objective reference in the Mazdakids and Kho-raminans, we might find the answer to the historical and philosophical hatred of Iran and Zoroaster, Plato, and Anfal and Shangal towards the Kurds. The reaction of history to the Mede/Mithra, which it essentially caused the birth of the history with Zoroaster and ..., was the reaction to the agreemental sexual freedom, jubilation, dance, and the earthly being of the Kurds. On the one hand, they carried out the re-pression and the genocide of the Kurds from Mazdakids to Shangal in chagrin and the lack of the sextula freedom, and in contrast to it, they founded the rational philosophical and the ethical constraints of religion, and they constructed the heavenly Paradise of God longing for the earthly paradise of the Medes, on the other hand. In contrast to the Plato's rational constraints and Zoroastrian religion restrictions, a reaction against these restrictions and a return to the freedom and joy of Mithra revolts in tragedies such as the Oedipus and far beyond the city laws. In the hegemony of metaphysics, happiness becomes tragedy.

The Greek thought is logical and mathematical. The combination of logical and masculine thinking of math with the love and mania of Dionysus / Mitra took shape with Pythagoras, but the kind of Mithra who passed the filter of Orpheus and whose fascination and mania were transformed into the sacredness of mysticism. Russell knows the mysticism/illuminationism along with math which is indebted to Plato and the entire Western philosophy revolves around its foundation as the memento of Pythagoras. This thought is the continuation of Mithra from one side and the split from Mithra from the other side. It means that the entire history of philosophy is a split from the continuation of Mithra. Greece is not only the mystical philosophy of Plato and Pythagoras but it is also the civilization of tragedies, Prometheus, the contract of the Sophists, Faust, Sisyphus, Oedipus, and Walter Benjamin. But apart from the

tragedies such as Prometheus, Sisyphus, and Cronus which are a modeling from Medes' Mithra/Zahak, there are some differences between the Greek tragedies and those of Mithra/Mede. We have already discussed the reason behind Mithraists going to the dark cave that was their tragic understanding of existence, and we even pointed out that the tragic understanding of Walter Ben-jamin was derived from the tragic vision of the Mithra's image.

But the tragedy is a latter form which we describe Mithra with it and the tragic becoming of the events such as Oedipus and Antigone is due to the dominance of metaphysical thought in Greece whose form is the tragic end of Mithra / Zahak was shaped by Feridon/Zoroaster.

However, before the advent of Feridon/Zoroaster, there was no tragic or comic form in the Mede itself, the philosophy of life was without naming, as there did not exist words such as Ahura Mazda / Demon. The latter sign of Zoroaster/Persia called the former sign of Mithra as Demon/Evil and called himself as the Ahura of goodness. In the former sign of Mithra/Mede, there had not appeared the division of the goodness/evil and good/bad in the horizon of meaning that its conflict would lead to the tragedies such as Oedipus and Antigone, or he would become aware of the emptiness or vanity of life. In Mede/Mithra, there had not emerged the consciousness which was the result of the escape from the crisis with the ataractics like God, Heav-en and utopia. Life itself was the same lived life. It is in the emergence of metaphysical philosophies and the emergence of playfulness Gods, like Zeus, which Sisyphus understands that he was the play-thing of gods and became conscious of the insignificance or vanity of life. There has not been any metaphysics or God in the Mede and Mithra became aware of the life's tragedies through understanding the oppression of the gods. Mithra /Mede was the stage of pre-aware-ness. It was the stage before being divided into good and evil in which they would understand life as tragedy against the image of goodness. Mithra was a pre-subject era and it was the action of the life itself. Oedipus, Sisyphus, and Antigone would become tragedy in the metaphysical culture as Zahak became tragedy with the advent of Feridon. The Oedipus was taken from the Median Zahak as follows in Bandhesh: " Zahak's mother is the embodiment of evil and one of seven great sinners, the first prostitute, adulteress with whose marriage was prohibited as based on law". The law is the constructed law of Bandhesh/ZoroasterZahak's mother as the prostitute and guilty in the same way that Ahura described Jihi as the prostitute. The story of Zahak killing his father was constructed by an Iranian mind since Bandhesh itself assumed Zahak's father as alive " while he knew his father was alive" (Bahar, 1369, 146).

The metaphysical narrative of Greece also constructed the Oedipus's patricide so that the guilty, Oedipus, find himself conscience-stricken, and make himself blind and leave the city of law, the divine constructed law. The tragedy is the remainder of Mithra, but in fact it was not the tragedy but the Paradise, in which the contract has been re-garded as the sin and regret with the emergence of meta-human laws of Zoroaster/Plato, and the prohibition of the contractual law. The contract preceded any law in Mithra, there was no law before an agreement, whether the urban or family law. Nonetheless, there arises the conflict of Antigone and Keroen and the Antigone tragedy is created in the emergence of meta-human laws and the replacement of human satisfaction with the divine / Shahi law. In Mithra, the laws are based on agreement and satisfaction. The king comes to the throne with the agreement and consent of the people, and the king has no law preceding the satisfaction and will of the people, but the sort of Mithra transcending the filter of Zoroaster and Plato generates the meta-human urban law of Keroen which leads to the conflict with the family desire to bury Brother by Antigone. As the law

creates the prohibition of the relationship through agreement and consent and the story of Oedipus / Zahak is interpreted as patricide and anti-constitutional and this contrary to the law constitutes the tragedy. Therefore, Mithra/Zahak is “the other” that causes the birth of all religions and philosophers has the same roots as the whole tragedies and stories such as Prometheus, Koroneus, Faust, and Dionysus and Nietzsche. The Sophists’ theory of the Social Contract, which Plato had developed the theory of permanent government of the forms against that theory, had its roots in Mithraism. If the generation of philosophy started with Plato, we have already said that his philosophy appeared in the contradiction with Mitra, and if Odesus is the story of the emergence of the Western philosophical reason, Odesus wisdom has appeared in the confrontation with the Sirens, that are the same Mithraism Fairies. Nonetheless, they are the anti- Plato, i.e. Dioysus from Prometheus to Oedipus, and Faust are the symbol of the return of Mithra. The history is the disruption in the continuation of the Kurd/Mithra culture.

### Messiah/Agostin and Mithra

It was not only Greek culture that developed in the hostility to Mithra and the Medes, but the enmity of Roman / Christian culture with Mithraists and destruction of their traces was such an enmity that if some of the Mithraists temples and caves were discovered even in centuries after, they considered them as relevant to the heroes and pre-historic ceremonies. The hostility of Christians with Mithraist is reflected in the story of the cave friends. In this story “we find the pursuit of the Christians and burying the Mithraists alive in caves and they were prosecuted and massacred by Constantine after his becoming a Christian in such a way that they were buried in Mehraba cellars or caves or they buried alive in caves or tunnels” ( Jordan, 1938. Quoting from Razi, 1380: 209-210). Of course, the story of the Cave friends was distorted by the heavenly books or the scripture, and they made it as Christian in the same way that Mithra itself was distorted. Essentially, the religion of Christ, that is based on the spirit, spirituality, the supernatural heaven and Sharia or divine law, is a reaction in front of the Mithraism’s emphasis on the earth and body, and the freedom of man, and the salvation of the human instincts and wisdom which is manifested in the framework of the divine and earthly city of Augustine. “The other” of the heavenly city of Augustine, i.e. the earth city, is the same Mithra and Mehrism that had great influence in the Roman empire. The ritual of Mithra was more associated with atheism than idolatry in Rome than the worshipable gods (Claus, 1999, 158). Of course, it is obvious that the intention behind atheism and idolatry in metaphysical viewpoint is earthly being and anti-metaphysics. There are different theories about the connection of Mithra with Christianity; Justin Martyr, the second century Christian priest accuses Mithraism of imitating the ceremonies of Christianity (Martyr, Wikipedia). Ernest Renan, the author of the book “the origin of Christianity” stated: “In case a fatal incident obstructed the course of the growth of Christianity, it would be the world of Mithraism” Renan, 1882, 572). Yamauchi in criticising Renan writes: his information are related to 150 years ago and it can not be considered as a good resource on commenting about Mithraism (Yamauchi, 2007, 175) and Patterson totally denies the existence of any relations between Mithra and Christianity (Patterson, 1921: 94) while Cumont knows Christianity as strongly under the influence of Mithraism that even after the victory of Christ over the atheism of Mithra, the art of Christianity has strongly remained under the influence of the art and symbols of Mithraism (Cumont, 1956, 227-8. Vermaseren, 1963, 104).

The doubt of some researchers regarding the absence of Mithra before Christ and the Christ not being influenced by Mithra goes back to the analogy of Roman Mithra with the Iranian Mithra which is plausible since the rituals of bull-killing, the cave, and candle have nothing to do with the Iranian Mithra. These scholars are unaware of the former original Median Mithra and even they are not informed that the bull-killing, the cave, and ... ceremonies have remained among the Kurds. However, there are many cases like last supper, bread and wine, baptism, candles and music, water pools, mentor (preceptor) and ... in Christianity which are taken from Mithra. In other words, Christ and Christianity developed, from one hand, in negation of the Mehr, and on the other hand, it is in its continuity, because the bread and wine of Christ, the birth of Christ and the Father, and ... are the copy of the Mithraism concepts but in reversed meanings. Mentor (preceptor) in Mithra is the salvation from spirit and Sharia / metaphysical hallucinations and ground political wisdom with the help of the social contract, but in Christ, the Father who is the same mentor in Mithra is the representative of God's law and he does not need to tie any contact with the people since he is respondent to God not the people. As they confiscated the divine charisma (the varieties of Shahs) but they interpreted it as divine and single Shah sign in Iran, the mentor of contract became upside down as the Father and the symbol of God. In contrast, Paradise and the happiness cave are Mithraism in which the Messiah (Jesus) constructed the heavenly paradise and supreme angles which are under the influence of Zoroastrian religion in the negation of Mithra's earthly paradise. Mithra that was perished by the Persians in the Mede found an extraordinary influence in Rome. As the influence of Mithra in the Mede caused the reaction of Zoroaster, his influence in Rome caused the reaction; even, the concept of Christ / Savior itself, is a Zoroastrianism concept which they developed so that he would destroy the root of the oppression of the anti-God Mithra/Satan. Zoroastrian Mages, who destroyed Mithra in the domain of their influence in the Persians empire, were worried about his influence in the Roman Empire. Thus, Matthew declared the coming of the Mages to Bethlehem and the herald of Jesus' emergence (Gnoli, 1986, 81), and it showed the joy of the Mages from the emergence of the anti - Mithraism religion; Messina also considered the concept of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew as inspired by the Zoroastrian doctrine (Soshyant) (Messina, 1933, 177).

It was in front of the paradise and the cave of Mithraism that Jesus constructed the divine heaven and the supreme throne of God. Mithraism continued despite the suppression and it reemerged itself with the decline of the metaphysics at the Social Contract theory of Hobbes and the earthly paradise of the French Revolution and Faust of Goethe ; hence, there was seen a return to the Kurdish Mithra in Hobbes who named his book/government as Leviathan or the Anti-Christ and Faust who sold his soul to Satan.

#### Heraclitus/Stoics and Mithra

As we have said, the ancient wisdom expressed philosophical concepts in the form of natural symbols and the salience of the fire in the metaphysical philosophy of Greece has not been constructed without reason. We have noted earlier that the cave of the ignorance of Plato is symbolic of the Mithraism/Kurdish bull-killing cave, and his bright theory of forms is a signal of the light of fire and the sun of Zoroaster. Prior to Plato, Heraclitus was one of the first to highlight the general rules beyond human personal life in the form of fire. In his view "the human soul has been made up of fire and water and the soul would get damp and humid through

going after the lusts and the element of its fire would decrease. In other words, he believed that going after passions is equal to death of the soul". The sort of water and the wet-ness that Heraclitus called it as a symbol of lowness and instincts (see chapter about Mithra), is a symbol of water and the humid caves of Mithra. As we have said, Mithra decocts the water out of the ground with the help of his arms after his advent and there are water springs in Mithraism caves even in Izadian Lalesh Cave today. The path of the water, unlike the direction of the fire that faces upward to the sky, goes down the earth / underground, which is why the snake and crab, living under the ground and with the soil, are present in the bull-killing ceremony while they are killing the heavenly cow. The water is a symbol of the earth, life, and human reason, and the fire is a symbol of heaven and soul, divine Sharia, or supra-human imaginary/Godly laws.

It is possible that Heraclitus was influenced by the Zoroastrianism in scarifying the fire and transpassing towards the spirituality. Probably, Heraclitus had some meetings with the Mages since there are some references to the Mage in the Heraclitus text which is the oldest Greece text (Yamauchi, 2007, 469). The Mages have migrated to the areas of Hellenism civilization after the capture of middle-Asia by the Cyrus' Persian army (Bidez, 1938: 90-92).

### Stoics

Stoics are the pioneers of the theory of the social contract and the laws of the universal justice in the continuation of Sophists and they utilize the fire symbol of Heraclitus/Zoroaster to express the universal rules and their equality. They were unaware that there is a paradox in the Stoics' philosophy that is the paradox of social contract, in one side and heavenly laws, on the other hand, which shaped the whole paradox of the Middle Ages. The paradox arises from two different sources: the Middle Ages and the Romans, which benefited from the social laws, rights, and contract, from one side, and from divine Sharia and metaphysical laws, from the other side. This paradox and the different sources is rooted in the contradiction of Mithra/Zoroaster. The social contract theory of the Stoics is derived from Mithraism but the construction of universal and suprahuman laws in the form of fire is taken from Zoroaster/Heraclitus. This paradox led the Mehr ritual to an uninterpretable paradox in Rome. On the one hand, they killed the sacred heavenly bull with the help of evil animals like the serpent and the scorpion in the dark cave, on the other hand, other solar and spiritual symbols had penetrated into it that I have already discussed. The theory of Thomas Hobbes' social contract, which Cassirer knows it as the return to the stoics, is, in fact, the return Mehr/Mithra. Sacrifying the contract for the sake of Levitians and the precontract laws of John Locke is the remains of the Stoics contract intermingled with Zoroaster/Plato since there are no pre-contract law in Mithraism. As we have said, the Mehr ritual had the great majority of Europe under its influence, and the theory of council and the convention, which some falsely attributed to the customs of semi-Germanic tribes, is rooted in Mithra/contract. The ground-based rules and the human / humanism value, which revived with the Renaissance, has roots in Mithra. It was the same emphasis on the earth, human and human laws which caused Jesus to react to the planning of the supreme heaven (Kingdom) and the Godly laws, and Augustine constructed the celestial/Christianity city against the Mithra's terrestrial city. Therefore, I dare say that the whole history and philosophy of mankind is a break in the continuity of Mithraism.

### The Sophists and the revolt of Socrates/Plato

First of all, it should be indicated that there do not exist necessary evidential facts to construct the effects of Mithra's principle on the Sophists. In reverse, if there are the effects of Zoroaster on Socrates/Plato based on the indications of Plato and some researchers, we will consider Sophists' borrowing from Mithra at the level of an analytical hypothesis based on the materials related to the influence of Dionysus (Mithra) in Greek philosophy and Prometheus' modelling of Mithra according to Cassirer and Russell. As the result, we will understand this point that the revolt of Socrates/Plato against Mithra was carried out through the mediation of Sophists.

The main aspects of the Sophists philosophy include: the human being as the criterion of everything, the priority of the individual over the truth and the negation of metaphysical and metahuman facts, the capacity of all human beings for the instruction of the virtue and politics, and most importantly, the theory of social contract. The theory of social contract and the negation of the truth and metahuman laws was one of the most important positions of the Sophists against which Plato presented the theory of the state and the eternal law (theory) of forms. It is not to be mentioned that the theory of social contract was from Mithra and was the Mithra/contract itself. The Sophists were the product of the Athens Society after the wars and Greek familiarity with the so-called philosophy of the East. We previously referred to the arrival of Mithra in the name of Dionysus and the filtered entry of Mithra along with Orpheus and Pythagoras, and the familiarity of Pythagoras with the Cave ceremony which Plato offered via modeling the famous cave theory.

The Sophists considered politics as the product of social contract, and they considered virtue and politics as teachable to everyone, and all are capable of political participation and learning virtue. The logical introduction of social contract theory is the negation of the metaphysical and eternal rules and facts and also cutting the relation between language. If we review the previous materials about Mithra, we will find their similarity with the Mithra style of living. It is plausible that the social contract of the Sophists has been derived from Mithra and the Medes given the Median prior Mithra and the Greece familiarity with the so-called eastern/Median thought in the same way that the Plato's cave was in address to Mithra his theory of the forms was influenced by Zoroaster. In particular, in the Plato's Protagoras treatise, which is the debate between Socrates and Protagoras, Protagoras, in reference to the story of Prometheus / Mithra, has clarified that virtue, politics, and justice are the general rights and the people equally have the capability to acquire the virtue, political participation, and justice. This caused Socrates to react with a theory of one virtue, one knowledge and the specific theory of politics and science with the example of medicine (Physician). Socrates revolted against the Sophists and he along with Plato founded the bases of the philosophy. In contrast to the multiplicity of Sophists virtue and truth, the theory of one truth and one virtue was presented, and the earthly reality changed into the metaphysical reality. According to the division of man into gold, silver and iron, only a few golds like Socrates and Plato have access to the reality. In contrast to the theory of social contract and the built-up artificial being of the Sophists politics/state, the theory of one government and eternal laws of the theory of forms were presented. Besides, in contrast to the ideas of equality and possibility of public education, the theory of the division of labor into manual and intellectual work was offered in which the thinkers have the right of participation, philosophical discussion and the possibility of finding the truth that its full form is the physician's theory. Thus, talking about the politics and truth are not the right of all but the physicians, or the same the philosophers that the others must obey them. Socrates considered himself as inspired by Apollo but Apollo was not so much popular at the time of the Sophists

democracy. Nonetheless, Apollo might have been influential at carrying out the death penalty of Socrates; hence, perhaps the Sophists were the followers of Dionysus/Mithra.

Following the uprising of Zoroaster against the contract of Mithra in which he defined the political order not as artificial but as inherent and in the continuation of Ahuraian order, Plato described the political order not as the built-up and the follow-up of the will and accord of humans but as the continuation of cosmic order and as originated from the theory of God/forms through the mediation of the king/ philosopher. Thus, the equality and justice of Mithra turned into the hierarchy or the same Plato's justice. Against the emphasis on flesh and the earthism, they presented the theory of spirit, forms, and the heaven. The Sophists become the symbol of chicanery and ignorance in the philosophy of Plato / Socrates, like the Mithraism cave of ignorance, while they were the main source of knowledge.

### Epicure and the Fate of Death

One of the main concerns of the Epicureans was the liberation of the people from suffering and pain caused by the collapse of the Greek government. The Greek government, like God, gave meaning to the life of Greeks and it was their philosophy. With the deterioration of the Greek state-city, the two problems of God and death obviously led to the spiritual pressure on Greek human. Against the tragedy of death, Socrates and Plato posed the problem of remaining the soul and the afterlife to justify the death. That Plato says philosophy is the practice of dying, that is, finding meanings for the justification of death.

The general philosophy of meaning - as Plato says- is the practice is to die and to find a way to immortality. The whole philosophy, religion and art came to justify the absurdity of life that its end is death. In answering the question of death, the religion justifies it with the eternal life hereafter. The religion says we are just waking up with death and the real life begins in heaven and hell after death. The world is the field for the Hereafter and the death is the harvest season, not the end of it. Religion gives significance to man's life with the mirror of God, and God defines his/her virtue, goodness and wickedness. Against the inequality of life and its tragedies, religion has defined the must-be or the ideal thing as the other world.

The philosophy is against the defect of what exists, and the answer to the question of death makes an autopia as a horizon for the correction of this world. The philosophy searches the autopia in this same world and it does not regard ignorance and corruption as instinctive for the man but as correctable. This is why, with the first philosopher in the true meaning of the word (Plato), Autopia was born to be as a horizon to reform the world and as a measure for its transformation. In response to the problem of death, the Greek philosophy considered the state-city as something competent to give meaning to the human life. The principle was defined by the collective life of the state - city, not the individual. Therefore, death in the path of the ideals of justice and the preservation of the Greek state-city ideals was not the end of life, but martyrdom in the way of civilization and the state - city achievements. Before the formation of the state - city, which taught the Greeks the meaning of life and practice of dying, before the naming of justice as the original value and the sum of all virtues, it was the courage the quest for name that justified death and gave meaning to the lives of men. Not because of the Hellenic civilization or of justice, for example, Achille fought merely because of courage and fame so that his fame for brevity would remain in history, and conquer death with the hands of



immortality. There was time that the Gods of Olym used to give this meaning to human life. With the deterioration of the state – city, Plato tried to design another mirror to give meaning to the life of man, and to justify the question of death with the help of designing of the theory of forms, and utopia, which was a horizon to guide the worldly life. The justification of death and giving meaning to life requires a mirror to achieve identity. Along with the collapse of the state-city and the mirror of Plato's theory of forms, the epicureans were trying to justify the death and give meaning to life with the mirror of pleasure and the Stoics with the creation of the universal wisdom. The mirror for the decoration of the human life in the Middle Ages had not the "state- city" not "the courage", not "the theory of forms", but it was this "God" and the afterlife, which gave meaning and justified the human life and the issue of death.

Through removing the metaphysics and replacing the wisdom instead of Shria (divine law) and the will instead of fate, Renascence resorted to the creation of other mirrors to justify the issue of death. For instance, Marxists considered the death for the sake of the ideals of workers class and the actualization of communism as the existence philosophy behind the development of the history and the justification of the evil and death. Max Weber regarded nationalism and politics as the justifications for the death and life meaning in the despoiled atheism world. Hanna Arent saw political action as the solution to this problem and others as Faciasim, Racism and ... .

In general, philosophy is connected to the collective ethic and justice and it considers the lost paradise or the original principle against decay as achievable in this same world, this is the ideal or the message of philosophy taken from Plato up to Hegel and Marx.

There is mysticism as against the philosophy. The mystics consider the bases of this world as founded on ignorance, lust, dissatisfaction and decay, and they say that the world wheel turns around the foundations of ignorance without which the wheels of the world fail to revolve. It means that they know the decay and ignorance as inherent and non- correctable in this world; thus, they did not believe in free-dom but in the restriction of human being and they did not have any hope to save the humanity from the deterioration.

Nietzsche's theory against the decline and the crisis of the universe is different from the previous two responses. Neither does Nietzsche, like philosophy and religion, considers the inequality that suffering as the decline to correct and to address it with values and an autopia, nor as mysticism, he seeks refuge in leaving up the world and seeking refuge in solitude and ascetic. Nietzsche's strategy is generally different. That is to say, the asceticism and life aversion of mysticism, and the "philosophers'" offer of utopia are the result of the cynicism towards the world, and what there is. Nietzsche, however, did not regard the reality of life and inequality of social relations as the decline so as he would try to reform it or leave it. If Nietzsche denounced the fact, he would deny the denial of the fact that it itself is the acceptance of reality. Nietzsche's motto is the return to and acceptance of life, that is, the same life. The response of the philosophy and religion is what Nietzsche has basted (berated) on under the name of the Apollonian trend and the rule of reason and morality. The strategy of philosophy and Apollon from the path of Christian morality to modernity led to this point that Nietzsche reject it with the concepts of Dionysus and the will (leading) to the power. The answer of mysticism is what Nietzsche considers to be the passive nihilism of Schopenhauer, which he aims to replace it with the active nihilism. Nietzsche accepts the tragedy of life with Dionysus dance, not like

religion, he takes refuge in hereafter, not like philosophy, he is in the illusion of transformation and destruction of tragedy, and nor like mystics, he resorts to leaving the world. The solution is the acceptance of this world without illusions of the soul and the other world through the Dionysus dance, that is, the same Mithraism paradise that give meaning to the human life, not the creator and metaphysical God, but it is the Khak (people), the contract, and the state/king itself. For this reason, we stated that Farah (very) Izadi in Mede meant the existence of kings since Izad and god meant king there, i.e. the king who has been elected by contract. There the gap between soul / body , god / man was not formed in the Mede and life was this same life and god / Shah (king) was deposed in the case of injustice. There in the Mede existed the more complete form of what Hegel sees in Greece about unity of society and god.

The totality of the god/government was formed not based on the negation of the individual so as it would lead to execute Socrates but it was formed based on the agreement between the individuals (Mithra/contract). There, the totality was rooted in the social contract and the paradise/heaven (Mithra/contract) existed in this same world, that is, there was not formed the split of soul/body, god/human, and the heaven/earth, something that there was actualized in a weaker form in the theory of the contract supporters and the French revolution again.

Thus, Mithra (contract/paradise) was a reply to the tragedy of life and the issue of death, not by taking refuge in the illusions of the hereafter and soul through eating the sedative pills of utopia, but by doing Kurdish Dionysus/Halperka dance or the same Mithra/contract and the meaningful God is the same Mithra/contract in life.. Zorvan, the god of death destiny has such an icon like Mithra in narrations, and we said that he has given the sovereignty to Mithra rather than Ahura, that is, Mithra accepts it through the awareness on the tragedy of death and the life with Dionysus dance, as God is in this same life. Therefore , Plato and Zoroastrianism, in the one hand, offered the philosophy of the soul in contrast to Mithra / Paradise and Epicurus is the same re-production of Mithra with some discontinuations. Epicurus gives a different answer to death under the framework of the materialistic philosophy, meaning that the soul is corporeal and it will decay after the death of the body. Therefore, there do not exist life after death and soul independent of body. Consequently, we must enjoy ourselves in this world, and avoid pain , although the Epicurian pleasure has a spiritual aspect, or better to say, it had a negative aspect, and it took a positive aspect in Sironists, and worldly enjoyment in the absence of spirits and the world Hereafter. Compare this with the discussion we presented about Mithra (spirit or body), dancing, drunkenness, and Mithra's worldly life.

#### Samian Political Reason :

We have no arena to interpret Samian political reason, and there is no need for it, since our discussion relates to Iranian political reason. However, we will try to prove that it was not merely the Iranian political reason that has been developed in rejecting and hostility to the Mede/Mithra political reason, but the Greek and Samian political reason have also been evolved based on the negation and "the other" construction of the Mede/Mithra due to its metaphysical being and its contradiction to the earthly life. Thus, we will attempt to exemplify samian political wisdom briefly as manifested in one of the inscriptions so as to explicate its similarity with Iranian political reason and its contradiction to the Median/Kurdish political reason as well. this will clarify that today's hostility towards the Kurds and their cooperation against the Kurds in spite of their many hostilities is not merely due to the logic of foreign policy and the practice of politicians, but it is in the nature of their political reason and the logical

result of their thinking and national identity. The pre-Islamic Arabic political reason nicknamed the Kurds as Nergal/Demon, Tokhma-e Tiamat/ Satan and irrational Gotis which were reproduced in Islam as “ the goblin” and “pagan (infidel)”.

Al-hazar:

In a very beautiful article presented in the second Congress of Mehrology under the title " Mehr in Al-Hazar", Derij Verse made some remarks about the religious eclecticism between Iran and the Mezopotamia (Sami, Qadri.) As the title of the article suggests there existed the similarity of Iranian Semetic political wisdom and their contradiction to the Median ritual. The following points are taken from this article.

Frantz Komon believed that the Iranian Mages were under the influence of the Babylonian priests and they have imposed their virtuous Babylonian theology on the Mazddaism. The gods of two religions were matched and their legends got close together, Samian astronomy dominated the naturaistic myths of the Persians; Ahuramazda equal-ized with Baal, Anahita with Ishtar and Mehr with Shams (Derij Verse, Gloska, 1385: 181) . As Komon has noted, Iranian religion has become synonymous and united with Semetic religion. There, the eclectic becoming of the Iranian-Mesopotamian religious co-thinking became a principle (the same: 182). Defending Komon's views, Vidongern refers to “Alhazar” several times in which the " Nargel " is drawn together with crab, snakes and dogs – Videngen knows as wolves ... that he considers them as the symbols of Mithraism ( the same: 182). The Nargel in the Semetic wisdom has the same role of Satan in the Iranian wisdom and Hades in Greek wisdom, the god the evil and the ugliness and the world of darkness and beneath the earth. Videngen has correctly pointed out that the Semites have shown the truth their evil /Nargel along with the Mithraism symbols; that is, their “the other” was Mithra. Before we continue the discussion, we should note that mainly the Mesopotamian Semetics have used Nargel to re-fer to the Zagros mountains, and the root of the word nargel is "moun-tain" used to refer to the inhabitants of the Zagros mountains or the same Medes and Gotis. Besides, the word “kur” was used instead of Greek Hades and Ibrian Sheol in the Sumerian language; this word originally meant “the mountain” but it gradually found the alian lands since the mountainous lands surrounding Sumer were continually the source of danger and threat (Kerimer, 1385: 135). The word "kur" means both mountain in referece to the chain of Zagros mountains as well as foreign or aian lands, because the alian countries or lands that Sumerians had wars or relationships with wer in Zagros mountains (Black, 1992: 114). Kur, based on the Sumerian ideology, is a gap between the earth's surface and the primitive sea that the spirits of the dead go there; therefore, to get to the moutains, the people must get on a boat and pass a river that can sink the people (Keramer, 1391: 135). Our-Nemo, the great king, dispatches for the Kur after death, Kur, the symbol of the underground world is the abode of the deads and it is special to the mortal men (the same: 136).

Kur is one of the names of the underground world, i.e. the lower world, or the world of the dead (Black, *ibid*) , the only danger that Sumerian and Babylonia faced lied in the mountains by the Gotis, Kasis, and the Medes. Gotis assulted Mesopotamia in 23 B.C. Kasis in 18 B.C. Later on, Babylon has always faced the Median attacks and their threats in such a way that they placed a stockyard around which became known as the Median wall. it is interesting to know that Samuel Kerimer knows the root of the word “Kurd” from the word "Kur".

Broses, a Babylonian historian living in the 3rd century B.C. that only some sections of his book have remained in the works of the other authors quoting Ibiwes writes regarding the Nova-Khistros storm (deluge) that 86 kings were the rulers of Babylon for 33091 years after the storm; after that the Medes took this territory ... eight of the Mede kings became kings in Babylon in 224 years. After that, 49 Chaldean kings reigned over the monarchy for 458 years. This news is based on historical events in 2300 B.C. when Gotis captured the Babel (Pourdawood, Dehbashi, 1388: 155). The aim of stating these points was mentioning it in the language of an old Babylonian historian that Zag-ros mountain-inhabitant taken from Goti and Kasi up to the Mede were always a threaten for Mesopotamia, which they addressed them as Nargel. Let us now go back to the main discussion.

Biwar considers the Roman Mehrism religion - which people practiced it and praised the evil in the dark caves - as a blend of the ancient Iranian elements of pre-Zoroastrianism (Mithraism, Qadri), with the appalling Nargel creed of Babylonian. This Iranian-Mesopotamia religious eclectism began in the era of the Medes when they occupied Ashur (Wers, the same: 184). Biwar also believed in the religious eclectism of the Iranian and Mesopotamia, which he has correctly pointed out that this eclectism initiated in the Medes period since the Medes were the common enemy of both sides. The common animosity with the terrestrial Mithraism religion provided the background for the union and eclectism of both Iranian and Semitic religious cultures, which may also be the cause of contemporary political alliances.

Hetra, Alkhazar in Arabic, means sacred location, Shams, or the god of sun and eagle had a great significance (the same: 189). The Arabs worshipped the eagle (the same: 196). Three gods of Merin, Bern Merin and Marten has been carved and designed in Al-khazar. Merin is the god of Shams. BerMerin, his son, is the god of the eagle, and the Mertin who is the same Dionysus in the inscriptions has been depicted as the two snakes rising of his shoulders (196197). The writer considers BernMerin wrongly as Dionysus and Mertin as the god of the moon which "Waghig-o Saliji" corrects his mistake rightly and he regards Bermern as the god of the moon and Mertin as Dionysus. This is the moon that takes its light from the sun, when BernMerin is Merin's son, Merin is the goddess of the moon and Mertin, with two snakes, is the hint to the same snake-on-the shoulder Zahhak.

The most important god of the Arabs is Shams, the god of the sun and the eagle, that two eagles and the head of a bull are standing on either side of Shams in Al-Hazar (the same: 199-200). The eagle is the sign of the dome of the sky and bull is the symbol of the sky and the stars (the same: 200).

"The gate of the temple, which is a religious relieve (fretwork) of Al-Hazar being at the Berlin museum: the full gallop is divided into three parts, in the center of the section, there are ingots of Shams, the god of the sun, and two eagles on its either side, beside the right-side of the bull, there is the head of a bull and on the other side, there is a lion-eagle which has turned its claws towards the bull. Further, there is one Medoz, one of the Gorgons beside the lion-eagle (snakehaired Greek Medosa and the Mithraism lion-eagle-Qaderi). The eagle and the bull are the signs of the sky, and the guards of the god of the sun, the Gorgons, and Medusa, who have a very terrible, hellish head, belong to the basement world, the combination of the Shams bust (torso) with two eagles is clear which means that the dome of the sky whose signs are the eagles are protecting the god of the sun ... - The bull is the indication of the sky, and the heavens

(stars) are the symbol of the heavenly gods of Baal, and Jupiter and Helosios... . Gorgons on the left side of the god of the sun are the signals of the world of the cellar, a mutual place with the heavenly bull. The whole central scene is the indication of the galaxy situation, the sun between the sky and beneath the earth ... the lion-eagle is in the world of the basement (the same: 201). Therefore, these images are related to Merin and Merton and Bern Merton ... . In the right side of the sun, there are bull and eagle, the symbol of the Merin and Berin Merin, which are the same Shams and the eagle, and the Merton who has the two snakes on the shoulder which are the same Medusa and the lion, the symbols of the earth and instinct. Thus, as the Medes and Mithra are transformed into Ahrimon (evi) in the Iranian culture, and into the snaky-haired Medusa which is killed by Perseus (Pers) in Greek culture, the symbol of Nargel, the Dark God are shown in the same form of dragons and the head of the lion which are the Median/Mithraism symbols.

In this picture, the lion-eagle implies is killing the bull on the gate. The eagle-lion has extended his claws toward the cow (the same: 202). In cow-killing, this lion is the symbol of Mehr (Bahar, 1984: 180). The lion head, Medusaahak, the , and Nargel are the same Mithra and the lion on the shoulder Zahak. Nargel or Hades which is along with the crab, the snake and the dog (wolf, Vidingern) are considered as the indications of Mehrism (Vers, the same: 203). The only god which has been shown with two snakes on the shoulder in Mesopotamia is "Ningizida", the god which is in the underground world and causes fecundity (the same: 208) and it is related to Nargel or Hades (the same: 209). Ningezida is the Semetized/Arabesized word for the snake-on the shoulder Ajidahak or Zahak. There are features of "Ningezida" also seen in the role of a serpent, with two snakes or a snake and a scorpion rising from his shoulders, or with a spear in his hand with a lions surrounding it and with spears in his right hand which a snake has twisted around it and two lions beside it (the same: 209). The lions and snakes are the usual companions of Mithra and the totem of the Medes. The eagle, the cow, and the sun and the sun are also sacred and totem in Semetic/Arabic, Iranian and Greek, and Jew-ish cultures. Thus, Iranian, Semitic, Jewish and Greek political wisdom has been developed in the pivotal period which was the transition period towards spirituality through negating and "the other" making of the Kurds/Medes political identity nicknamed as irrational Nargel in Semetic culture, into the lion-head and the snaky-haired Medusa in the Greek culture, into Jin (goblin) in the Jewish culture, and into Ajidahak and Ahriman (evil) in Iranian culture.

The unification of Semetic with the Iranian reason in contradicting Kurds' quest for identity is also well evident in the Zulqarnain myth.

Zulqarnain, Gog and Magog:

83. They ask thee concerning Zul-qarnain. Say, "I will rehearse to you something of his story."

84. Verily We established his power on earth, and We gave him the ways and the means to all ends.

85. One [such] way he followed, 86. Until, when he reached the setting of the sun, he found it set in a spring

of murky water: Near it he found a People: We said: “O Zul-qarnain! [thou hast authority,] either to punish them, or to treat them with kindness.”

87. He said: “Whoever doth wrong, him shall we punish; then shall he be sent back to his Lord; and He will punish him with a punishment unheard-of [before].

88. “But whoever believes, and works righteousness,- he shall have a goodly reward, and easy will be his task as We order it by our Command.”

89. Then followed he [another] way,

90. Until, when he came to the rising of the sun, he found it rising on a people ay,

90. Until, when he came to the rising of the sun, he found it rising on a people for whom We had provided no covering protection against the sun.

91. [He left them] as they were: We completely understood what was before him.

92. Then followed he [another] way,

93. Until, when he reached [a tract] between two mountains, he found, beneath them, a people who scarcely understood a word.

94. They said: “O Zul-qarnain! the Gog and Magog [People] do great mischief on earth: shall we then render thee tribute in order that thou mightest erect a barrier between us and them?

95. He said: “[The power] in which my Lord has established me is bet-ter [than tribute]: Help me therefore with strength [and labour]: I will erect a strong barrier between you and them:

96. “Bring me blocks of iron.” At length, when he had filled up the space between the two steep mountain-sides, He said, “Blow [with your bel-lows]” Then, when he had made it [red] as fire, he said: “Bring me, that I may pour over it, molten lead.”

97. Thus were they made powerless to scale it or to dig through it.

98. He said: “This is a mercy from my Lord: But when the promise of my Lord comes to pass, He will make it into dust; and the promise of my Lord is true

" They ask you about Zulqarnain, say: now I will talk to you about him: we gave him the kingdom on the earth and made all the needed instrument for him to rule; thus, he ran the areas so far as the sun sets and it seems that the sun enters a spring which has the greycolored water.

There, he found a group, we told him now you can behave with them with torture and cruelty or you can treat them nicely. It would be premature that someone who oppressed suffer, he said, and when he went to God, he faced a strict torment. But one who believed and showed good behavior would receive a good reward and God would solve his problems and we showed him a way and he went so far as to see the sun rise, he found a group of people or a tribe and he saw that there was no covering between them and the sun, so we became aware of him in such a way. Again he went on to the spot where there were two great walls, where there was a tribe which they did not understand (our) language, they said, Zulqarnain, Gog and Magog have done the corruption and destruction in this land and we will give you the necessary money and goods to build a barrier between us and them. He said:

The verse was revealed in reply to the Jews who tried to test him about his being the last of the prophets. This question has been derived by Jews from the Torah whether Mohammad knows about the books of the previous prophets like Torah or not (FarshadMehr, 1388: 247). Most of the Islamic scholars, including Ibn Sina, Fakhr al - din Al - razi, Abo Raihan-e Bironi and ... have regarded Alexander the Macedonian as Zolgharnain. Tabri believed in the existence of two Zolgharnain, he considered the former as Feridon and the latter as Alexander (ErfanManesh, 1388: 28). The author (Qadri) does not need to engage himself in various theories about the identity of Zolgharnain, which is not necessary here. Besides, the author does not insist on recognizing and identifying the factuality of Zolgharnain as neither I have such a background knowledge nor it makes any difference for me the absence of his reality. However, while I was doing studies, I noticed many similarities between Cyrus and Zolgharnain, from one side, and Gog and Magog, from the other side since many researchers have considered Feridon (Cyrus) as Zolgharnain. If the scale weighs in favour of Alexander, it may be due to this reason that no one knew Cyrus in Islamic era. The name and the identity of Cyrus was not disclosed until the new discoveries of the historians. Perhaps, If the identity of Cyrus was known as Alexander in the Islamic period, the majority of Islamic historians would consider Cyrus as Zolgharnain rather than Alexander. Ibn Asir has also regarded Feridon as Zolgharnain and he considered Noah as Feridon who suppressed Ajidahak (Ibn-e Asir, Rohani: 90), and in case Noah was Feridon, his enemy – Gog and Magog would be the same Ajidahak

The descriptions of Gog and Magog as well as the Fatwa of their massacre that have also been confirmed by the Qur'an are not unlike the Avesta descriptions and the Massacre fatwa of the Medes. First, we should consider that the question regarding Zolgharnain was asked of the prophet of Islam by the Jews, and the Jews holy books had previously expressed the description similar to Zolgharnain in addressing to Cyrus, and they have even known him as their Christ. In the dream of Daniel Nabi while conquering Babylon, the Persians and the Medians' kings (Cyrus) have been named as the ram owning two horns, which Zulqarnain may mean the ram with the two horns. In the book of Ezra, Cyrus has been likened to the eagle of the east.

The Quran has been watered as a heavenly scripture along with the Torah and the Avesta from the same source. Many of the Koranic concepts such as heaven, hell, devil and ... have been abstracted from Zoroastrian Avesta and Jewish Torah. In Zoroastrian Avesta and Jewish Torah, there are descriptions like Zulqarnain from Kaykhosraw, Feridon, and Cyrus and descriptions similar to Gog and Magog from the Medes and Mithraists. If Avestians called the Kurds/Medes

as (dave) demon, evil and dragon, the Jews also denounced the Kurds as the mountainous son of bitches born as the result of the intercourse of So-laiman's maidens with Jens (goblins). The Bible, which names the chil-dren of Noah, sees the Medes as the brothers of Gog and Magog from the Yafes generation (descendant) (quoted from Kahlan, 1375: 172).

Johnnese, the prophet writes that the devil is released from prison and prepares Gog and Magog at the end of the time (Apocalypse), which, based on the view of Hazghial, the prophet, the Persians confront him (quoting ErfanManesh, the same: 37-38). John in chapter 20 says: "I saw an angel coming down from the sky, with him was the key of hell and a huge chain in his hand, so he seized an old live dragon which was the same satan and evil and he chained him for a thousand years, and And he threw him into the Abyss, shut it, and sealed it over him, so that he could not deceive the nations until the thousand years were complete. After that, he must be released for a brief period of time. Thus, he says: When the thousand years are complete, Satan will be released from his prison, and will go out to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to assemble them for battle. Their number is like the sand of the seashore. 9 And they marched across the broad expanse of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city. But fire came down from heaven and consumed them.... thrashed him into the hell locking the door of the hell to his face so as not to mislead the future nations, and after a thousand years, of course, he must be released and abandoned for a while". Thus, he says: "then, when a thousand years was over, the devil got out of the prison to gather the nations, Gog and Magog who are in the four corners of the universe for the war while their numbers are more than the pebbles of the sea, then they ride over the surface of the world and they surround all the military camps of the saints, then ascends from God's side from the sky and eats all of them, and the devil, who diverted them would fall in the the lake of the fire and matches and he would lie wildly with the prophet, and soon be tortured day and night forever". We can deduce from this afore-mentioned part that Gog and Magog were giant nation or nations and they have lived in the northern parts of Asian flourishing areas and they were belligerent and well-known peoples in the war and the plunder.

We have already said that the devil /satan is the abstraction of the Me-dian Mithra in the religion of Zoroaster, which has entered into other theistic religions. That evil is liberated at the apocalypse and he prepares his troops (Gog and Magog) for the war is the same as the release of Mitra / devil from the Ahormazd Prison, and Zahak from the Feridon Prison; hence, Gog and Magog must be the Kurds. The imposter or the anti-christ, which emerges as anti - god at the end of time (apocalypse) was originated from the Mithra and Zahak of the Iranians. In Naisha-bori narration, the antichrist would entangle the good people in the end of the time (apocalypse) and would cut them into half, which is an analogy of the domination of Zahhak over Jamshid, which cut him into two - halves. The fire exits out from the mouth of Zahak, in the Torah, the fire comes out from the mouth of Dajal (the anti-christ). Zahhak has a thousand tricks and ugliness, Dajal (dervij or lie) is one of the names of Zahak in Avesta, that is, the word dajal means lie which it was deg-gal in origin derived from the Arami verb (daggal zan) turning into (dajala) in Arabic and dajjal means a person who lies a lot. (Hessi zada, 1384: 46). Therefore, the emergence of Gog and Magog as the enemies of Satan in the Apocalypse is a reflection of Zahak and Mithra's emergence in the Apocalypse. Islamic religious / Arabic culture has some roots in the mythology of Mesopotamia, the song of the Ashur-e Bani pal addressing Mardok has written of Oman Manda and Togdami, and it has considered Togdami, the king of Oman Manda as the son of the Tiamat (Tiamat is the anti- Mardook or the same



Iranian Ajidahak- Ghadri) (Aloov, 1388: 399). We have already said that Oman Manda is the same Medes and Gotis – refer to the historical generalitis - and Oman Mand is the same Gog and Magog (Nikitin, 1377: 46).

Abdollah Bin-e Khadad quotes from the interpreter in the court of Mo'tasam that: " Mo'tasam dreamed that the dam was broken and he sent a group to visit it and they gave the names of Babo-Albvab, Alan, and ...(the same: 209). Mohamed bin Najib al - Bakran, author of Jahan Name (the world letter) quotes that Motawakil of Abassids sent a group to determine the place of the Gog and Magog Dam around the Teflis and Armenia areas from Samara ... " (the same: 110-112). Bai-zavi sees the dam of Bab al Bowab on the side of Darband as the Zulqarnain's dam.

Thus, Gog and Magog were not in the East, related to Masajots and Oriental savages, but related to the old place of the minor Mede, the site that later became the residential area of Khoram Dinan and ... . We expressed the Kurd being of its inhabitants until the 5th century CE (A.H), up to the time of Saljoghids and the Mongols and it was the residence of the Median tribes like the Kasiees and Kadosies.

The Koran describes Gog and Magog as "a mountainous and wild tribe who have not had their share of civilization, understanding and speech". Balami writes: there were people on the side of the mountains like human beings called Gog and Magog being in two groups, one are the sons of Gog and the other the sons of Magog. Jabalain is the site of Gog and Magog (Bal'ami as quoted by ErfanManesh:1388: 62). After the conquest of the Mede, the Arabs called that place as Jabalain or Jibal (the mountains).

Koran describes that nobody understood the language of Gog and Magog, or they did not understand the language of others. Eshpoler writes that in the early Islamic centuries, people called those who did not understand language and their language were confused and any-body did not understand their language as Kurds (Eshpoler, 1386: 436). There have been other descriptions of Gog and Magog, such as " their women were communal or shared and their men were strong, profligate, corrupted, and ...". These are the same descriptions in the Achaemenid inscriptions, Avesta and Shahnama of th Mede move-ments/Zahak the snake othe shoulder, Gaumates, Mazdakids and Khoramdinan which indicate their earthly/ Dionysus being.

It has also been refered that the people sued the complaint from theGog and Magog to Zulqarnain, which is a reflection of the same constructed lie of theMedes complaint from Astiag to Cyrus or Ka-veh's complaint of Zahak.

## Islam

Islamic culture, which is originated from the Koranic sources, consid-ers Kurds as from the descendants of the Jins (goblins) and the satans. Mohammad Afandi in his book "Taj al Oroos" considers the origin of Kurds as from genes. Based on his idea one-fourth of each Kurd derives from genes since they are lineage of Belgheis – Soleiman's wife – whose mother was from genes. Abo Moayan Nasaghi in "Bahrol Kalam" writes , "Genes attacked and controlled the Harem of the prophet Soleiman. Some of the women there got pregnant as the result of sexual

relations with genes and they gave birth to children who are the Kurds. Quoting the Islamic historians, Sharafkhan Bitlisi in Sharaf Name writes: "Demon married mankind and the results were Kurds tribe". Masoodi also in Marwaj o Azahab, volume 3 writes: "When Soleiman lost power, Satan got hands over Soleiman's bondwomen in hu-man's appearance. Thus, believers and those who took refuge in God survived but unbelievers and heathens succumbed to Satan and be-came pregenant from him. Soleiman told those pagant (infidel) bond-women: take away the Kurds to the montains and there Kurds came into being as the result of them.

Further, Taj Aroos considers Kurds as people who existed on the earth before the creation of Adam. Jafer Sadegh recognizes Kurds as off-springs of gene "Kurds are from genes" and Said: "trading with Kurds is unlawful". He further provides more support for his idea by stating that: Kurds are a tribe among the genes' tribes that God made them impudent. Moreover, in the same narration interaction and marriage has been proscribed and interdicted with them. Abi Rabi'e Shami says, " I asked Imam Sadogh: Some groups of Kurds come to us and trade with us, can we interact with them. Imam answered, " O Aba Rabi'e : do not associate with them since they are decedents of genes and God has made them impudent ([http:// Yafatah. Blogfa.com](http://Yafatah.Blogfa.com)).

Making them im-pudent can be a reflection of the corruption and sins of Yajoj and Ma-joj. Islamic culture has been developed from the prejudiced soul of Ar-abs as these insults in Islam are the reproduction of the same accusa-tion among Sami people living in Mezzopotamia before Islam. Ad-dressing Goutis ad Medians, they called them, "piquant snakes of the mountains and agressors of the gods territory" (). The king of Guotim has been manifested as a fearful Monster in myths (). Goutim tribes were introduced as wild and unwise not being able to create a real and legal kingdom (). Nowadays ISIS and Hashdo ' Ashabi are the representatives of the Islamic/ Arabic and Iranian/Zoroastrianism in opposi-tion to all Kurds especially Yazidies.

Sharafname has mentioned prayers claimed to be narrated by the prophet Mohammad cursing Kurds not to possess their own govern-ment perpetually. If Islamic religious and ethical customs are the con-tinuation of Zoroastrianism and the concepts of paradise and hill are derived from it, then Quran can be the resumption of Vandidad. In that case calling Kurds as gene and Satan in Islamic culture is the re-production of their labeling as Demons in Zoroastrianism. Since the Iranian pre-Islamic hierarchical empires were reproduced in the forms of Safarian and Abasians, divine charisma (Farae – izadi) became the shadow of god (zilo sultan), Yajoj and Majoj (Gog and Magog) deemed to be killed in Quran are likely to be the same Zoroastrian Demon and Jewish genes. Perhaps the iron dam of Zolgharnain to prevent their further advancement is the reflection of Kava- the ironsmith and the shackle and chain with which he prisoned Mithras and Zahak in a cave. Closing the mouth between two mounts is the sign of closing the cave in that story. Based on Quran, Zolgharnain overcomes Gog and Magog with the help of God as Feridoon with the help of Fereshta conquered Zohak, KayKhosrow dominates Afrasiab by the help of Hom of Izads, Cyrus took over Astiag through sacrificing to gods and Persiysus – progenitors of Persians - triumphs on Medosa – ancestors of Kurds - with the help of the god of Hermes and Atena shrine.

Even Islam interdicted eating the meat of pig and dog in the face of the Yarsanians/Mithraists' pig-killing and tf the dog sanctification. Moreo-ver, Islam devoted a chapter or secton of Koran under the name of Cow in contrast to Mithra's cow-killing ceremony. However, the rejec-tion of Mitra does not mean modaling it. The mosque altar (Mehrab) is the same as the Mithra's

Merhaba (altar) with this difference that Mehraba is the place of dance and drunkenness, but Mehrab became the place of prayer and worshipping . The image of Islam along with heaven, wine, pleasure, and ... is the same Mithraism terrestrial paradise which became the celestial paradise in Islam. Without the picture of the Median paradise, dancing, drunkenness, and philogynism, the prophets were unable to create an image of the celestial heaven.

## Chapter 8:

Kurd and History: the History is the split (Breaking) in the Continuation of Kurd-Mithra

With the advent of history in "pivotal period" along with characters like Zoroaster and Plato, the Jewish prophets and the Iranian empire, Kurd was eliminated from the pass (wheel) of history and was driven back into the prehistoric and non-thought realm of history. Given the logic of history - which I pointed out in details in the text – Kurd was removed from the history, and history and the historical ethnicities basically appeared in contrast to, in rejection, and in “the other” making of Kurd. Therefore, Kurd became “the other” of the history. Therefore, it will be possible for the Kurd to re - emerge only by the end of history and , as Kurd was a pre - history ethnic group, it will also be a post-historic group. Kurd has performed something that

the post historical and post-modernist thoughts have thought of, and it is only with the help of post-historical thoughts that we can give birth to the newborn of the Kurds. Today's battle of ISIS and IRI with the Kurd is the battle of history and the last breath of history with the posthistory which is the subject of the next book. The history initiated with the pivotal period and the characters such as Zoroaster, Plato, Pythagoras generated prior to the identity of Mithra/Mede and in contrast with it. The former signifier of the history initiated with Cyrus/Zoroaster, which Hegel considers the beginning of history as with Iran and Cyrus/Zoroaster, is more later than the former signifier of the Mede/Mithra. The later signifier is in contrast and continuity with or the separation in the continuation of Mithra. The late signifier in contrast with the earlier Mithra called the later self as goodness and being nice and called the former Mithra as the evil and badness. It means that Mithra was badged as evil, demon, the cave of ignorance and the earthly city in the religions and philosophies of the world, from one hand, and the foundations of world philosophies and religions are the concepts of Mithra and they basically emerged in contrast to the crisis of Mithra, in the other hand. If there did not exist the crisis, philosophy and religion failed to generate in answer to it.

According to Hegel, the Minerva owl flies in the sunset. Heidegger says that history began with questioning, and there are no problems and crises, there won't be posed any questions. We have already talked about the philosophy of the emergence of Zarathustra that the crisis that Zarathustra emerged to tackle was the Mithraism cow-killing ceremony. The simple form of this issue is that the cow blessing from India to Egypt is a reaction to the cow-killing ceremony of Mithraism/Medes, which is still preserved in the ceremonies of the Pir-e Shalyar in Hawraman and Izadies in Lalesh in the present time. The Ahura and Asha of Zoroaster are a reaction to contract/Mithra which was badged as evil and demon. The theory of the forms and goodness of Plato is a response to the cow-killing cave of the Median Mithra and its earthly contract. The emphasis on Heraclitus' fire is a response to the importance of Mithra in Median water. Augustine's heavenly city and Christ's supreme heaven are a reaction against the earthism and earthly city of Mithra. In the same time, from the tragedies of Greece to the birth and the last supper of Christ are the confiscations of the Median Mithra. In fact, the history of metaphysics is a discontinuity in the continuity of Mithra (paradise/contract). The heavens and the autopias of the philosophers are the same confiscation of Mithra, paradise / contract. The metaphysical heavens confiscated Mithra/paradise but they took it to the heaven; the philosophers made Mithra/contract as a model for the political reform while they made Mithra (contract/paradise) a symbol of Satan and sin and the political order of the philosopher king - King and the Prophet - was a reaction to Mithra/contract. This paradox became a stimulus for the history. On the one hand, they established the metaphysical morality against Mithra/paradise, and they confiscated the Median paradise and transferred it from the earth to the sky; on the other hand, they established the cosmic political and hierarchical order.

Did the Kurd become Kerol or Kermol?

What is the secret behind the successive failures of Kurdish riots and the Iranian political successes during the long-time history? why have the Kurdish riots always failed and why has the model of the Iranian political order always been able to reproduce itself? In answer to these questions, we have used two words of "Kermol" and "Kroll", which are two Kurdish concepts that their meanings can hardly be expressed in English, to express the issue better. "Kermol" is

the feature of some-thing which becomes extincted and collapsed from inside or internal decay of something, but “Kerol” is the feature of something which has the internal solidity but it faces the unfavourable situation from outside

The Kurds /Medes were discordant (incompatable) to the usual proce-dure in the ancient world as the logic of the content of Persian, Sami, Greek and Jewish reason was founded based on a metaphysics in the pivotal period of history, and the terrestrial Kurds were rejected on the margins of the content of historical reason. Thus, the development of the content of the Iranian / Sami and the Jewis / Greek political reason occurred through marginalizing and the other making of the logic of the Kurdish action (irrational rebels). The unreasonable action of the history excluded (deprived) the wise irrational rebels from the history. The Kurds were known as Ahriman (satan) and Ajidahak (dragon) in Iranian/Zoroastrian culture, as serpent-haired and lion-headed Medosa In the Greek cuture, as the descendent of Tiamat, unwise Goties and Gog and Magog in Semetic/Arabic culture, as Jins (goblins) and the sons of satan in the Jewish cuture; moreover, Khorni, the Armanian historian regards the foundation of Arania as related to the victory of Tigran over Ajidahak, the king of Mars (Serpants). Therefore, the Kurd has been not only in contrast to the Iranian political wisdom but also to the whole history and the carrier ethnic groups of the history; hence, the history has not given any of its shares to them. The history initiated with transition to classifying the community and transition to spirituality, the kurds were deprived of history because they did not undergo the class logic and spirituality. However, the ground has been provided for the emergence and role-playing of the Kurds with recent develop-ments in the West in which the personal life has been preferred to the spiritual overview and as Alexander Kojo says, the man has returned to animalism before the history.

As the beginning of history with the Iranian, Jews, Greek and Semetic metaphysical civilizations was the end of the Kurd, the beginning of the end of history is the end of our deprivation of history. The sunset of history is the future sunrise of the Kurd. In fact, post history theory or the end of history will be the beginning of the Kurd.

Aliyev sees the influence of class culture into the Mede from devel-oped countries as the cause of the final deterioration of the Mede ( Aliyev, 1388: 405) . Wishofer, who has a social analysis of the Gau-mates uprising and considers it as the introduction of the communist revolt of Mazdak, knows the causes of the Gaumates defeat as the same conditions that contributed to the deterioration of the Mede (Wishofer, 1389: 120). Diakonove also knew not undergoing the slav-ery culture as the main reason for the failure of Median movements like Ferawartish and Chisertokhma against Dariush, which he considers it as necessary for the evolution of society and history. Karl Jaspers, in the book of “the origions and goals of history”, considers three basic ideas of the axial age as the tranformation to spirituality, the transition from the corporality cage and the formation of the great empires. The societies that have not undergone the ideas of the axial age remain as natural and historyless ethnicities.

Even if we consider the Marxist approach to history as an ideological perspective special to Western societies, no one can deny that the past history of the East and the Middle East has also been class societies based on slavery and serfdom whether the master or the slaveholder be the government or class. It seems as if the necessity of having the his-tory and evolution of

society is the transition from the slavery / class process, from one side, and arrival at a religious / metaphysical culture, on the other, which they are ultimately dependent on each other. That is, the inequality of society, the formation of the caste and class, and the separation of the ruler and obedience causes the formation of religion, myth, and ... to justify the class discipline or order of society. Thus, from the economic viewpoint of Marx to sociology of August Kent and the philosophy of Hegel's history, all consider the transition from the processes of the class / religious the master/slave, and the metaphysics as the necessity of civilization, history, and life. In fact, the classification of society and its becoming religious and metaphysical are interdependent or correlative.

In the past chapters, we have explained in detail that the Kurds had never undergone the logic of hierarchical justice and class culture and the culture of Shah worshipping, and they have always been rebelling and rioters from the Goties period up to the Medes time and from Gaumates up to Mazdak era and even later up to Khoramdinan. Even if they owned a political order, such as the short period of Medes and Gaumates, it would not undergo the class culture and the sanctification of the society and the sanctification of the king and this same factor led to their final deterioration or becoming "Kerol". Besides, the culture of Mithra religion constituted the Kurdish culture that was not based on spirituality and the transition from the carnality cage, but it was a secular and physical culture that knew the soul as the cage of the body, and it did not regard the divine right of kings to form empire, but he contract and general agreement. Therefore, if the driving engine of history, based on the Hegel/Marx interpretation, is the relation between the master / slave or the serfdom, since the Kurds did not endure the master / slave logic, and they preferred the life of the mountain to slavery in civilization, they were banished from the history and the history discarded them out. In case, according to Jaspers / Hegel, the driving engine of history, has been the transition from the carnality cage to spirituality, the formation of the empire, and the abstract meta-physical ideas, again the Kurds with the ritual of Mithra have been loyal to corporality and the earthly life, and they have not carried out the conquests. Therefore, they remained without history as "a natural ethnic group".

The secret behind the Iranians becoming durable and permanent and Kurds becoming deprived from the history is the same. Schelling writes "When we say we say something is durable and permanent, we mean that its existence does not conform to its essence and nature" (quoted from Lockach, Farhadpour, 1385: 32). To live, the man should deny the life. To live means living something up to the end, but the meaning of life is that nothing is living completely up to the end (the same). The Kurds just existed but the Iranians lived. The being of the Kurds is compatible with their very nature, but the Persians being is not adaptable with their nature, but they adapted themselves to the outside world. That is why we say that the value of the Iranians is survival, but the Kurds' value is self-expression. The Iranians underwent any dominance to preserve their survival, taken from the rule of Greek up to that of Arabs, the Mongols, the Tatars, and ... . However, the Kurds preferred their biological freedom in the mountains to the slavery of others in civilization. Instead of succumbing to the logic of reality and adapting to it, the Kurd was faithful to his human nature and tried to adapt the outside world to his human nature; therefore, his rigid nature broke down in dealing with the whole outside world. Nonetheless, the mystic nature of Iran disappeared into the totality of the outer world. The class civilization and culture of Iran synchronized with the non-human process of history. Upon meeting the popular and anti-class culture of Islam, which the Arabs were their aristocrats, nor the Persians, the greater Persia faced a recession or, as it is said, "two centuries of silence".

"The moral and political frailty of the Iranians got worse by the admission of Islamic democracy but renewed in the era of Samanids ... (430). Christensen "knows the causes of the decline of a situation of the public government established with Islam in which the aristocracy classes entered and vanished among the mass of people, the aristocracy and the clergy classes ruled over for centuries ... which later became the foundation of the Abbasids government" (368). Iranian class culture was only viable to continue in the class world, but the culture and civilization of Greater Iran encountered recession by the arrival of the popular culture of Islam, which has been denoted as two centuries of silence. Greater Iran was revived as Islam undertook class culture and Shah worshipping of the Iranians and the hierarchical justice replaced the communal justice at the time of Abbasids. On the contrary, the anti-class culture and their anti-monarchy culture of the Kurds was in contrast to the usual condition of the outside world, and that class and spiritual culture caused them to decline as the history initiated with classification and the lord/serf relation; the Iranians became the masters and the Kurds turned into the slaves.

As the principle in the old world was the class and spiritual culture, the Kurds were excluded from history rather than the Persians. The reason behind the Iranians' triumph and the Kurds' deprivation of history was not the Kurds' weakness or the Iranian power, but was in the difference of the nature, contrast, and interaction of each with the outside world. The Kurds abode faithful by their very human nature, nor did they undergo the logic of inequality of the outside world. On the contrary, the Persians were disconnected of their very human nature and gave in to the dominant logic of the outside world. The Kurds' revolt against Iranians is the insurrection of the original human nature against straying out of humanity. Until the deviation from the originality returns to its human nature, the riots will be continuing. The pouring of the Kurd's red blood indicates the redness of the sunset on the horizon announcing the end of the day of Iranism. The Kurd is a white tablet which announces the end of the black night. The Kurd is an untouched tablet which the darkness and the blur of the outside world has not shadowed it. The cave is a friend whom the illusion of the sunlight has prevented to visit. Therefore, the deprivation of the Kurd from history was not due to its moral or national weakness, but their original nature caused this sort of deprivation. The history is a result of an error not the development and progress. The Kurd will achieve its rights through the transition of history from error to its right path, by passing the illusion of spirituality and Apollonian dreams to his Dionysian and instinctive nature, through the transition from despotism in any form to the personal life, via the transition from Plato's justice to Marxist justice, through the transition from the domination of the generalities to the personal life, and the thought transition from history to post-history, can achieve his right. The history had the necessity but not the originality. The beginnings of history was the end and the symbolic death of the Kurd, the history began by transition to morality and classes, any one not entering into the morality and classes of history remained or stayed out from the convoy or caravan of the history. The history was the end of the Kurd; thus, the end of the history will be the revival of the Kurd. For this reason, the Kurdish order, contrary to the Iranian order, was merely an external order but it did not improve up to the level of concept and theory, as the historical concepts did not have the possibility of processing the Kurdish order that was opposed to the historic order. The Kurdish order has no abstracted at the level of the concept and episteme, which is why political materialism of the Kurd and its social practice have not been carved into the minds. The political action of the Kurd is formed in a theoretical vacuum. The Kurd was

loyal to the law of its heart and and it did not give in it to the necessity of history and the logic of its symbolic order; therefore, the history expelled it out of the definition sphere of the humanity, and he acquired some titles such as snakes, devils and satan. The Kurd is the negation of the history and the action not the positivity, which is why it is only with recent developments in the post-modern west of post-modern that all sanctities were turned into smoke, "the Great other" was facing deterioration and the possibility of uttering the Kurd's political/historical actions will be provided.. It is only with these latter opinion that we can give birth to the newborn he Kurd and theorize and internalize the Kurdish external order.

### God/History and Mithra/Satan

Hegel stated that the world history begins with Iran, with Cyrus because it was Cyrus who established an empire in its precise meaning for the first time. This term of "state", which Hegel used, was very important in his philosophy. But what is important here is Hegel's use of the word "Reich" which is, in fact, equivalent to the word "empire. Hegel says Iran was a Reich, that is, an empire. Hegel said that I said that the world history begins with Iran because the Iranians used the government for the first time and the present government is the continuation of the same inference of the government; the same thing has also occurred in the religion. That Zoroaster said "Ahormazd is the light" is an important word in the history of the religions since the religion was utilized in the new non-incarnation (idols and other worshipable things) meaning. In Hegel's point of view, the history of new religions will lead to the Offenbar religion which Hegel says this religion was formed for the first time in Iran. The light equals exactly to the awareness, that the Iranians said Ahormazd (God) is light means that God is knowledge. In Hegel's interpretation, god is awareness.

As we mentioned before and the whole of this book suggests, the political reason of Iran whether in the form of the empire of Cyrus and the religion of Zoroaster appeared in contrast to the ruling of the Medes and its Mithraian religion. Therefore, according to an inference derived from Hegel, the history was created in contrast to and the other making of the Kurds. We also noted before that the axial age of history, which Jaspers pointed to it, developed with Plato and the Empire of Persia. It began with the elements of transition to spirituality, class structure, and the conquering empires, in which the other or "non" of Plato, Zoroaster and Cyrus emerged in the framework of anti-concepts such as the cave of ignorance (Plato used this in address to the ceremony of the Mithraists dancing in caves), the Ahriman (demon) of Zoroaster – in reference to the Median Mithra -, and the hierarchical empires with the Iranian divine legitimacy in contradiction to and the failure of the contractual ruling of the Medes.

Thus, the history appeared in confrontation with the Kurdish. The Kurds are the other or "non" of the history. The iconic order of history generated in the face of the reality issue of the Kurd. The Kurds are the non-thoughtful domain of the thoughtful history and the necessity of the moral motivation of history is the dark-remaining of the un-thoughtful domain. For this reason, the Kurds have remained so unpopular and blurred in history that based on Kochra they are the Pandora's box of history. Indeed, today's intense fighting of the IRI Corps and ISIL with Kurdistan are the last remnants breaths of the thoughtful history and the error of history against its origin. It is interesting that Kojo, one of the leading interpreters of the history of Hegel, especially its master / slave section, which Fokoyama presented his theory of "the end of



history” according to his interpretation of Hegel, considers the formation of the master / slave gap as the initiator and stimulus of the history. The end of the book of the philosophy of Hegel's history, regards the end of history and the return of man to Animalism when Napoleon appeared mounting the horse in the light of sunlight in Prussia. We have already noted that history began with the transition to spirituality and the animalism, which Kojo refers to, does not have the negative connotation of the animal mentioned in metaphysical religions, but it denotes returning to the biological and personal instincts of man and breaking down the sacred illusions and ideologies. In the same line, the general purpose of the Frankfurt and postmodern school are critique and negation of the general concepts, spiritual illusions and the liberation of human biological and personal life from the sovereignty of the spiritual delusions. As opposed to the stimulus of history, in which the body is defined as the cage of the soul, Foucault correctly knows the soul as the cage of the body and the only salvation is the freedom of the body and flesh. Therefore, I dare to say what the post-modern scholars thought about, the Kurds have put into action long before; hence, and with the marriage of postmodern thinking and practice of the Kurds, we can reconcile the theory and practice and the history will come to an end.

Hegel has indicated another contemplable point of view that God itself is history. Unlike Augustine's God, Hegel's God is not beyond the history so that the history goes on through his will but God is the history itself. As the history has arisen in contrast with Kurd/Mithra, God himself appeared in contrast with Mithra. The first God which became the creator of the sky and the land, and the constructor of the morality and the revelation (oracle) was the god of Zarathustra, that is, AhorMazd which was constructed by Zoroaster in contrast to Ahriman/Mithra. Islam and Christianity, and even Plato's theory of the forms are influenced by Zoroaster, i.e. the same light as Hegel refers to, which is why the devil of Islam and Judaism and the cave of ignorance of Plato and the Greek Hadis of the are same Mithra. Therefore, God himself is the contrast of Kurd and Kurd is the other or the devil of God. for this same reason, we encounter such names such as satan, devil, evil, and demon and ... in address to the Kurds which we have referred to them in the content of this book. The sin of Satan in the metaphysical narrative is the same sin of the Kurds and Mithra. The Satan refusal to obey God, who called on him to bow to Adam, made Satan rejected forever. The call to bow before Adam was the beginning of the same hierarchy and master / slavery system that Hegel and Marx referred to. The philosophy of creation began with violence, as the history which, based on Hegel, began with Cyrus and Zoroaster, had its roots in the violence against the Mede/ Mithra. Satan said to god, we are both creatures and equal, and why should I bow to Adam? Satan defended equality and did not bear the master/slavery logic, but the creator/master God cursed and rejected Satan forever. Cyrus and Zoroaster also built the foundation of the master/slavery and the hierarchical structure of which Mithra/Mede did not undergo the foundation of the historic hierarchical structure and spirituality illusions with the help of the equality structure which is evident in the elective sovereignty of Diako, the concept of Mithra as the contract, and Mazdak and Khoramdinan movements: hence, the Medes were similiarized to the cave of the ignorance, serpent-haired Medusa, the dark world of Hades, Ahriman, dave, Jin and the underground city by the God of the history and its messengers like Plato, Zoroaster, Augustin and ... The curse of the Satan in the divine court of God is a symbol of cursing the Kurd in court of the history. The Satan accepted the curse for ever, but it did not yield to the logic of the master / slavery. Also, Kurd/Mithra accepted the curse of history forever, but he did not give in to the logic of

God's master / slavery. God is the same constructed Ahura of Zoroaster in against Mithra that named him as the devil. The Satan is also the same Mithra. The Kurd/Mithra, which is prior to the concepts and logic of the history, will emerge again only with the deterioration of the history of metaphysics and the decline of Gods.

#### Apocalypse (end times) and the Re-emergence of Dajal (Impost-er)/Mithra

" An Armanian heroic story narrates how a Gurd, (perhaps a Kurd- Qaderi), named Mehrak was directed to a cave by a claw, he is now imprisoned in that place having the wheel of destination his hand and waiting for the end times ... (Russel, Dehbashi, 1388: 776). In some other Armanian myths, "there is a mythical hero called Mehr who is said to be jailed along with his horse in a cave entitled as "Zimp Zim-ips" ... he whirls the wheel of fate there and then he appears in the end times" (Boile, Kloska, the same: 89). There is a young Mehr in another narrative that seeks revenge for the enemies of his father ... he finds the solution on the tomb of his father and his mother, they both show him the way to Wan where there is a cave inside a rock. Mehr enters the stony cave in company with his colt –Corkig Jalalin- which a black crow guides him, then the slate closes together and Mehr and his horse are jailed ... the cosmic wheel in front of his eyes ... when this wheel stops its movement, Mehr will come out from the stony tomb riding on the horse, the old world will come to an end, and the monarchy of Mehr will begin with justice ... (Boyle, Dehbashi, 1388: 90). Both his parents guide him to the stony cave – Mehr is displaced and excluded from his land - but he refuses to do so and he asks the father Egyptian kingdom and asks the mother Tehran kingdom that they (his father and mother) nicknaming him as the deathless Ghabil tell him you have no place on the earth, go to the stone cave ... (Boyle, the same: 94). )

Mosa Khorni writes, " The old women narrate that he (Mehr) is imprisoned in a cave – Mehr is shackled and chained and two dogs munch the chains, and he tries to escape and end the life of the world, but the chains are tightened by the sound of the hammering of the smiths ... " (Khorni quoted from Boyle, the same: 100). Mitra is trapped in the cave and turns the wheel of the world around. The wheel of the world, the wheel of history is whirled by Mithra, but he himself is out of the wheel of history. this is what I mentioned in the introduction that the Kurd is the unthoughtful domain of the thoughtful history, Kurd is not a piece of the game of history, but the invisible rules of the game of history which he himself is not inside the game of history". He is what I mentioned in the theoretical basis that, " Kurd is a real matter or issue that does not exist but the existence of Iranian/historical reason is formed based on its negation". The just monarchy of Mehr in apocalypse (end times) is the same return of contract of Mithra instead of the divine right of kings and philosopher king, the example of which is the struggle of Kurd democracy with the divine right of ISIL and the Islamic republic and Ottoman Turkey. Since in history, as according to the ruling of class justice and spiritual culture, there was no possibility for the role-playing of the Kurd with its earthly culture and equality justice, only there would come the possibility of the Kurd re-emergence in the end times along with the deterioration of metaphysics that was a justification for inequalities.

The emergence of Mithra, who is named as Dajal (imposter), Satan, and Zahak in the Persian / historical mythology, is approaching: " At the former time, the Iranians called the Caspian Sea as Chichest and there is a Khosnami (mysterious) belief that there is another secret society of

new-believers that is located at the depth of the Caspian waters (chichest) . Once a year, the mountain of Damavand and the Caspian Sea are opened and their special residents will look at each other ... the counterpart of this exists in Armenian belief that the Mehr cave overlooking the lake of Wan is opened once a year in the evening of Ascension day. Of course, the cave is opened permanently but Mithra himself will emerge in the end times ... after the Mehr-killing winter ... (Russel, the same: 776). The inhabitants of Damavand are the same as Zahak who was imprisoned up to the Apocalypse by Feridon, and the residents of the Chichest Sea, i.e. the same Afriasiab, were arrested under the water in Chichest, and both are the same Mithra in the Wan lake that are jailed in the cave and he (Mithra) will emerge in the sunset / historyset in the in the Apocalypse or the post-history.

Zahak/Astiag being the cave is a symbol of his being Mithraist, perhaps his being in exile up to the end time and revealing the great mystery. Mithra has stood near the same mountain that Feridon imprisoned Zahak. It is exactly near to Damavand where "Mithra has stood on his feet and this is the same mountain that Feridon had put Ajidahak into jail where he would be killed by Garshasib in the end times" (Russel, Dehbashi, the same: 772).

Shaol Shaked says: "Mithra will tell many of the secrets at the end of the world to a person at Pedash Khorger on the sea coast on the north side of the Alborz near the Damavand mountain (Shaked quoting Rus-sell, the same: 769). Russell, though mistakenly believed that revealing the secret occurs on the condition of the final battle of Mithra against evil, "it is likely that these secrets involve the policies of the final battle against evil"; however, he has preserved the true core of Mithra's cow-killing ceremony" leads to scarify the cow .... Which is reminding us from Mithra's cow-killing". If the battle is with the evil, why would it be along with the cowkilling of Mithra against the cow-killing of evil while the sin of evil himself was cow-killing? For this reason, Russel is stuck or caught in this paradox. ... Most of this objection is taken that different bothering animals attack the bull at the cow-killing scene which is something that the man seldom expects to see in that cosmic cleansing and renewing moment ... The successive eternity of the uni-verse begins with the killing of the bull by the evil and the descent will be spread" (the same, 769-771). It is not difficult for Russel to get rid of the paradox that he has trapped in and wondered about – how come for the evil animals to be present in the stage of the cow-sacrifice that is a Ahoraian and sacred action for a restoration of cosmic order; the solution is that to replace Iranianized Mithra with the former Median Mithra, in which the aim of Mithra in cow-killing was not to restore the cosmic order, but to fight with and destroy it, as it was also the aim of Zahak, Gaumates and ... the secret that Mithra aims to reveal is not the struggle against the evil as Mithra himself is the evil but it is to free Zahak and ... to fight with Ahura, Feridon and the sacred cow. It is the existence of these same secrets in the mountains of Alborz in Damavand ... where is the place of Zahak's incarceration that is also known ... There is another narrative which Mithra himself, as based on the Armenian tradition, will inhabit in the rocky cave until the end of the finite time, or he will be imprisoned" (the same: 775). Thus , the destiny of Mithra is linked to the fate of Zahak and they are the same with the fate of the Afrasiab, the evil and the Daves, which are chained in a cave.

The cow-killer Mithra is the ally of the cow-killer Zahak. " There would happen the battle of Zahak with Ahura at a specific moment in the end times. Mithra himself is the witness of a contract when its time is estimated to be the Gomzishen , that is, when the sun is in Aris, the

day of Hormozd, the month of Farvardin, the first day of spring in the six thousandth year of the creation, when the evil will assault the uni-verse, and the eternality will initiate along with the ejection of the evil ... that time the sun is in Aris ...' (the same: 776). The specific time of the battle, as Russell has pointed out, is in Hormezd day of Fervardin, the first day of spring. In Persian mythology, the devil will assault the sacred cow in the beginning of spring in the beginning of the creation. The evil leaped from the sky to the earth in the month of Farvardin (Bahar, 1376: 89). As we pointed out before –in the section about Mithra, spring or fall-all the Kurdis/Median movements, such as the Median alliance, the invasion of Assyria, Gaumates' uprising and ... were in spring and the victory of the Iranians, such as overcoming on Gaumates, the triumph of Feridon over Zahak ... were in the fall. Therefore, the final battle at the end times, which is in Farvardin in the spring, is not the triumph of Ahormazd and Feridon over the evil and zahak, but it is vice versa. Mithra himself, like Zahak, is imprisoned in a rocky cave up to the end of his life and that in the same mountain, he will tell a secret to someone- as Shaked says, this secret is not Ahurmazd's victory over the evil, as opposed to Russel, but it is the secret of Mithra/evil himself over Ahura and the victor of Zahak over Feridon and Gashtasib. "In the of the world, Zahak will turn into the evil counterpart of the cow-killer with it multiple evil horn" (Russel, the same: 773). Apparently, Iranianized/Zoroasterized Mithra along with Feridon is the frontline battle with Zahak and evil in the Iranian myths. However, as we provided evidences that it is the distortion of the reality and that sort of Mithra has nothing to do with the real for-mer Mithra. The original Mithra, along with Zahhak, is in the frontline battle with Ahura and Feridon. As he assaulted Ahormazd the creator in the beginning of creation in company with Jahi and the Daves, he along with Afrasiab, Gog and Magog will attack the Ahura-ian/Feridonian creation. But what was the secret that Mithra revealed?

In orthodox Zoroastrianism, the first attack took place from beside the evil who then failed with the prayer of Ahormazd (Zener, 1377: 38), because, if the evil became unconscious, how would he created Ako-man –the bad thought- in front of Vahomne. Probably, the origin of the myth may have been Zorvani in which the evil had been victorious at the beginning (the same: 37). Mithra /Medd has a historical prece-dence over Ahura /Persia and this was not the Ahriman (evil) / Mithra who turned against Ahura, but it was Ahura /Persia who rioted against Mede/Mithra. Therefore, as in this myth, Ahriman (evil) had prece-dence over Ahura mazda, but why was the dominant and the anteced-ent Mithra rejected and what is its connection with the religion of Zervan?

The religion of Zorvan is very older than Zoroastrianism, as Neiberg says: "it is necessary to put aside this hypothesis, that the belief in Zervanism was a conscious attempt that that tried to connect two con-tradictory principles. The fact is that Zervanism – as Neberg has said- is much older than Zoroastrianism. That Neiberg is trying to make a religion out of Zervanism in line with God Almighty, the cult of wor-ship and especial theology is hard for us to follow; ...Zorvanism is nei-ther a religion nor a solution, but rather it is a kind of tendency" (Gaiman, 1387: 4). Thus, Zorvan is older and the images available from him that has shown him as the god of time (Koronos) and like Mitra, as a lion-headed with a dragon around it, there, without doubt, Zorvan and Mithra has become the same (Varmazin, 1344: 165). Zorovan was like the father of two twins of Ahura Mazda and Ahriman (evil) (Glos-ka, 1388: 138). Zorvan is the same Mithra and precedent to Ahura.

In the Iranianized mythology, Zorvan sacrificed and prayed for thousands of years to have become a clear and pure child; desperate after thousands of years, he would fall into doubts. Ahura was the result of his sacrifice and prayer, and the evil is the result of his doubts. Zorvan expected to have a beautiful and bright son but, first, the ugly and dark devil was born, which he was dissatisfied with his birth, and then Ahura was born who wants to give him the ruling of the universe. but because he has already made a vow to give the first born child the ruling over the world, he would keep his promise against the devil complaint and would give him the ruling over the world for 9 thousand years. Despite the trickeries which has penetrated this myth, its real core remains as the truth, which according to the contract, the ruling for 9,000 years will belong to the devil/ Mithra, then Ahura. But the contract was broken and Pars/Ahura abducted the ruling much sooner than a thousand years from the Mede/devil against the contract.

There also exists the constructed lie of Zorvan's discontent with the birth of Satan - Mithra is in Judaism in which Ishaq has the desire to succeed Isa or Judas, but they replaced Jacob via the trickery of Jacob's mother misusing the blindness of Isaac. Thus, they justify the myth of the first birth of Jesus from his mother's abdomen in this way Jacob has given the birth precedence to Isaac as the result of Isaac's threat signifying the slit of his mother's abdomen while Isaac is the first child and has the right of succession. The trickery of manipulating the myth has a Zoroastrian tinge that Zorvan has not wanted the evil/Mithra and he has preferred Ahura while the image of Zorvan is similar to Mithra.

In the Iranian mythology, Ahura is the result of prayer and sacrifice, and evil is the result of the doubt and hesitation. In religion the sacrifice and dogmatism is good, but in reason, doubt and uncertainty is good. All the evil and the dirtiness of Ahriman (devil) comes from the doubt and hesitation in the theological and metaphysical dogmas. The devil is born from the doubt and uncertainty, which leads to revolt. It is doubts and hesitation existent in the dogmas and sanctities that have appeared in the myth of Zahak in the form of brain-eating, i.e. the brain drain.

5th century, B.C: the debate of Azarhormozd with Mobed-e Mobedan (the priest of the priests): "Which one should be worshipped ... Hormozd who was born with the help of the prayer and sacrifice or Satan who came into being via his will" (Christensen). The Iranians have accepted Ahura who is the result of prayer and sacrifice and we (Kurds) have accepted the evil which was the result of doubt and independence from God's will. Based on J. Mar's view: "Belief in Satan among the Kurds is different from the understanding of Ahriman (devil) among the Iranians, since the evil in Iranian myths came into existence via Zorvan's doubt but – as based on J. Mar - devil in Kurdish culture is a symbol of the freedom developed by the separation of God from free will and freedom of will". Therefore, Satan calling of the Kurds was due to this fact that we have defended the freedom of will against the sovereignty of the gods. The devil stands for freedom of will. In the religion of Zoroastrianism, "the man, Mashi and Mashyana, does not inherit the guilty nature, but just when he uses his free will to select good and evil, he becomes just or guilty" (Yama Ochi, 1390: 501).

But what was the origin of the myth of Zorvan? The origin of the myth of Zorvan has given priority to the birth of the Ahriman/Mithra. The Zorvan itself is in the shape of the lion-headed and the dragon, like the Ahriman/ Mithra, and he has given the ruling to Ahriman/Mithra for 9 thousand years. If Zorvan liked Ahura, how would he give the sovereignty to the devil? Then,

Zorvan would have asked for the ruling of Mithra/Ahriman. Therefore, they obtained the sovereignty from Ah-ri-man and his friends like Zahak and ... and they broke the contract by the betrayal of Ahura to Ahriman/Mithra who transformed into Ahura mazda via his separation from him. The secret, which Mithra will tell Zahhak in the end, is related to revealing this fact that he will assault again at the beginning of spring and they will get their revenge from Ahura's companions. The secret that he reveals is how he has received the sovereignty before the nine thousand years came to an end, which, according to the treaty, the sovereignty belonged to Mithra / Ahriman. Ahura has breached the contract and he has questioned the sovereignty of Ahriman (evil). Horazd (Ahura) himself allied with the evil that they determine the time of the struggle for 9 thousand years ( Zenir, the same: 40). But before that time, he himself took over the sovereignty, which is perhaps a symbol of taking the sovereignty from the Medes by Cyrus and Persians or the triumph of the Iranian despotism over the Kurdish contract.

As it is evident from this story, Mithra will only emerge in the end time and along with the end of the history. There must be destroyed the wheel of the world that has been shaped based on the master / slave system and the illusions of spirituality so that Mithra/Kurd will appear again. It seems that these conditions have been provided with postmodern ideas and with the notion posed by Nietzsche, Freud and Marx (we referred to them in theoretical foundations section) which these theoretical context of this emergence need to be smeared with Kurdish praxis to reunite the theory and practice. The emergence of Mithra (paradise / contract) is the realization of paradise on Earth with the Halperka (Kurdish dance) and the return of politics to the contract and agreement.

Finally, another much important point to be referred to is the reversed dual contrasts. It means that Cyrus/Feridon appeared against Zahak/Astiag. There was Astiag prior to Cyrus and Cyrus appeared just to negate Astiag. There was Mithra whom Zoroaster called as Satan and constructed Ahuramazda against him. There existed the Mede which the axial age of history appeared in opposition or as the revolt against it. However, all these things reversed in their religious texts, as they possessed religious and historical texts in which first of all there was God was, then the Satan rebelled against it while the god was an uprising against the Satan/Mithra

Iranology, the science of history and historiography of Kurd :

Not only was the Kurd marginalized in history, but also he was margin-alized and ignored in the science of classical and modern history. The reason for this in classical historiography was the source of the information of Greek historians which was not based on research and observation but the acquisition of the oral information from the dominant Persians. The Persian aristocrats, as the main information source of the Greek historians, have fed them their Shah (king) worshipping myths as the real history from the angle of their love and hatred and their en-mity with the Medes and the Greek historians have sealed them as the science and the history. The myth of the plural Aryan Iran was constructed in modern Iranology as the result of the Iranian colonial policies in giving legitimacy to their own empire, from one hand, and as the result of the Orientalists' reaction to Anktil Dowron's book introducing the real character of Zoroaster to the westerners, on the other hand. With the help of Iranological genealogy in classical historiography, we will understand that the concepts like the cultural Iran, multi-ethnic

Iran, Iranian being of the non-Fars nations specifically the, the Aryan race, the Zoroasterianism, the manifesto of Cyrus' human right, and ... are not expressing the realities of Iran land but they are the constructed truths of the westerners that the Iranian historians in Mashroota (constitutional) era developed and spread through imitating the western orientals for satisfying their Iranian/Persian nationalism sensations. More-over, they established these views with the emergence of the Persian one-ethnic state and they made them internalized among the individuals' minds of the Kurds, Arabs and Baloch people under the title of be-ing Iranian or constructing, for example, the subject of the Iranian Kurd. In fact, in the time of the hegemony and dominance of the Kurds to the land of the Mede, which later became known as Iran along with the dominance of the emigrant Persians, the science of history (geek historiography) was not formed; hence, the modern historiography was also associated with the myths of Aryan racism. In fact, the written history is only a sort of narration, and who has been the narrator has an important influence on the reinterpretation of history. The past is not in our access and there are just some historical manifestations (Selden, 1393, 163). These manifestations are the product of the language structure, which they, in turn, are counted as the ideological products or the cultural constructions (Abrams, 1993, 249). No knowledge of the past is free from interpretation (Bennet, 1995, 94). The history is always be-ing made and it is prepared for rewriting and changing (Ibid, 93), the historical texts are a reflection of power relations (Bertens, 2001, 179) and the power relations are constructing the imaginary history of Iran.

The science of history (historiography) appeared simultaneously along with the Persians dominance on the Median territory. In fact, the word of Iran and the Persians dominance was ingrained in the Mede land and it stayed as eternal in the sovereignty of the constructed truth.

When the Medes were the original inhabitants of this land and its name was the Mede, the historiography had not been formed. That was the reason why the names of the original Mede got into the abyss of oblivion and the Iranians / Persians names, in the time of the Persian ruling which became simultaneous with the development of the historiography science, stamped its seal on the history. Because of the historical coincidence of the development of the science of history with the Kurds be-ing under the Persians dominance, the Kurds have always been condemned to be at the margin (brink) of the history and politics and their marginalization became eternal in the dominance of the truth. The contemporary historical research was also derived from the works of the Greek historians and for this reason, the Persians were introduced as the main owners of civilization and politics and the Kurds were considered as its branches and margins. That is why the rise of historiography was the sunset of the Kurds.

The Greek historiography, unlike today, was not based on research and investigation but it was only based on the oral data that they would get from the Persians themselves. As the result, the land that was the cradle of civilization with the Mede/kurd residents was called the land of the Persians, and later Iran. However, the lack of the Median concepts before the Persians coming to power does not mean the lack of the Median/Kurdish content. Unfortunately, because of the political governance of the Pars on the Mede and the confiscation of the Median culture, language and works, the Persians destroyed the whole Median resources, inscriptions, symbols, and traces. Thus, on the one hand, they hid the roots of their political violence and ethnic domination, and on the other hand, as they were immigrants tribes lacking any culture and civilization, they tried to confiscate the language and the culture of the Medes in history. This same strategy became the source of the information for the Greek historians.

The time these materials were written is simultaneous with the codification of the science of history. It was the period of the Persians sovereignty and the Medes decline. The time when the science of history came into being, the Kurds were politically marginalized; hence, they were driven to the fringes of the context of the history. Therefore, the roots of the violence of the Persian sovereignty and territorial legitimacy of the Median sovereignty can not be deduced from the recorded texts since this incident traces back to a more distant time than the era of the Greek historiography. The structure of the Herodotus text, which we will come to it below, does not have a structural difference with the Bistoun inscription which was written from the language of the ruling ethnic group who is only one side of the conflict. Since Herodotus nationalized the history with the legitimacy-giving ideology of the Persian sovereignty as the science of the history sector as the science of history and the myth –as Roland Barthes says it illustrates the narrations as innocent - replaced the history. Which source has Herodotus, the father of the historians, accessed his information which has become as a source for other historians after him and even as the basis for the notes of the outstanding contemporary historians?

Herodotus and Xenophon began recording history several years after founding the Achaemenid Empire by Cyrus and Darius. Philosophers such as Plato have gotten their knowledge of Iran from them. But what were the resources that Herodotus and Xenophon utilized? Where have the stories of the law-abiding of Darius and the human rights of Cyrus and Cyrus been derived from?

This story is rooted in the Persian king-worshipping myths which Herodotus gave a scientific / historical perspective to it for the first time. The source of Herodotus' information about the history of Iran and the Medes were the Iranians themselves like the descendants of seven anti-Iranian aristocrats or Persophiles like the descendants of Harpag (Aliyev, 1388: 29; Cook, Cambridge, 1387: 230 – 240; Rainhart, the same, 240). Herodotus himself also admitted to get information from the Persians: "In this case (the story of Cyrus), I follow that group of the Iranian writers whose aims have not been the glorification of Cyrus' conquests, but they have stated the absolute truth" (Herodotus, 1387: 76). "the miserable father of the historians has thought that he has expressed a theory that had absolute truth, while he has never expressed historical facts, he has quoted the legend of Kianians and he has brought the legend into the form of the history" (Hertsfield, the same, 46; Safa, 1384: 39). He was not aware that the narration which he considered to be closer to the wisdom is the remnant of the Iranian myth which has heard from Persian (Safa, the same: 40). Therefore, the kind of character which has been presented from Cyrus and Pers is not a real/scientific and unbiased view but it is a copy of the myths and Shah-worshipping mentality of the Iranians themselves. Herodotus was mesmerized by the Persians and he confirmed their information, which the Pers' elites put in his disposal and that information was not taken from the culture of the people but it was the reflection of the ideology of the Fars elite (Munson, 2009: 457). The source of the information were the Persians themselves, and his information was gotten neither directly nor they had any foundation in historical facts and archives (Liverani, 2003, 1). It is natural that the eyes of love and hatred of the Persians - not the common people but the clan of the nobility and descendants of Cyrus and his pensionaries - described themselves as the representatives of the goodness and their opponents, who were the Medes, as evil like all the rulers of historical power. The Greek historians also reflected the Iranian power and Iranian issues, the angle of their own vision and not through observation and research. If we surveyed today's Iranian government from the



viewpoint of the love and hatred of the rulers and governmental documents, not from the perspectives of the impartial historians and out of the power viewpoints, it would be the best demo-cratic and the most just system in the world whose leader only owns a rigged rug in his home.

Xesenphon Kurou Paideis (Cyrus the Letter), which has adulated Cyrus and Iranians as an ideal modal of kingship, is a mere naration and prate as based on unanemous views of the historians. (Wishofer, 1377: 71; Diakonov, 1388: 49; Aliov, 1388: 34; Shahbazi, 1350: 100). The science of history does not confirm any point of Xenphon's materials. Xenphon who was one of the Socrates' students and Socrate was one of greatest enemies of democracy together adored Cyrus.

The myths - based on Igileston, the myths are the ideologies of pre-industrial societies - of Herodutes and Xenphon accord with the King- wirshipping myths of Iranians and this will provide more evidence not for the validity but for the non- sceintific and non- historical aspects of these myths. The co-ordination of Herodutes' text with the Duruis' in-scription in Biston does not prove their validity since the content of Da-ruis' inscriptions were sored through out the teritory and we should ask whether Heridutes has referred to them( Beryan, 1380: 153).

Daruis, who had initiated a widespread propaganda with the help of the main languaged in all of empire states, translated the contents of the inscription into the various languages like the Greece and he promulgat-ed them among the Greek people (Dandaif, 1386: 83). Therefore, Heridutes used the translains of the inscription in Greece so that as Ravinsen says some of the Herodutes' materials are the word for word translations of the inscriptions so he has stated Samirdis as Mage - from the same mother and father ... under the influnce of information in the inscription (the same: 186)

Herodutes has taken his information with regard to Guamates from Zo-piros or Otans and the seven aristocracies who were anti- Gaumates as his story accorded to the claims of these seven people. Herodutes had acquaintance with the son of Megabizos, Zopiris who had fled to Athens, and Otans who was activating around Greece (Cook, Grishwich, 1387: 240). It was natural for the aristocratic families whose power and property were the result of Cyrus plundering others' lands to speak well about them.

Thus, the only source of the Greek historians was the oral informstion taken from the rulers in power. Besides, the only narrators of the histor-ical events such as the conquest of the Mede and the defeat of Gau-mates has been written from the viewpoints of the king wirshipping mentality of the conquerors in the history which nobody could criticize them. Moreover, the ruling power circulated his naration as the truth and did not permit any other narations of the events. Consequently, these official narations of the rulers and conquerors of the wars considered themselves as good and recorded their interperetation of the inci-dents in the history as legendary; hence, they assumed the defeated na-tions as the symbol of the evil, the demon, and ...

Why is the border between the myth snd history clear in the so- called history of Iran? The change of the historical people into legend and po-etry is the result of the lack of the historical knowledge and methods. But why has not there existef anything under the name of the science of history in ancient Iran. Why was not historiograohy there in ancient Iran? Because the King alone ordered and negated rhe whold inhab-itsnts of the country like their father, he carried all

the actions and all the other people were like his serfs, he himself got the thing to be composed and decided what to write and record for the future (Klima, 1371: 47). For instance, Darius introduced his writing regarding the events related to Gaumates' uprising as the absolute facts that no one should question their truthfulness. Darius the king says: "when you see the pictures in the inscriptions that I wrote, do not destroy them and if possible, preserve them" (DB, 4: 67-69). "If you see the pictures and the inscriptions, and if you do not destroy them and if possible you do not destroy them, Ahormazd will be your companion ... and he will bless the end of your work... if you see the pictures and the inscriptions, and if you do not destroy them and if possible you preserve them, Ahormazd will hurt you and he will ruin your dynasty" (DB, 4: 72-80). Thus, what the Greek historians narrated under the title of the historical facts was the reflection of the Persian ruling ideology to consolidate their dominance and to acquire the legitimacy of occupation/confiscation of the Medes in the dominance of truth.

The modern historiography is not immune from this issue. In addition to this fact that the base of most of these historians' information is the same king worshipping myths which the fathers of the historians have given it a scientific appearance. The promulgation of Aryan racism myths have had a great impact on constructing the ideal history of Iran and the personalities such as Cyrus and Zoroaster. In what follows, I will refer to the ways in which the Zoroaster, the prophet of the violence and the ally of the Persians/Achamenids in the annihilation of the Medes was turned into the hero of intellectualism up to the level of a philosopher which can be taken as a model for the construction of the totality of Iran's history.

From one side, European countries did lack a historical and a civilized base from their own and they tried to construct the Aryan prophets and civilizations for the sake of their own past in contrast to the Semitic religions and prophets. In the other side, the colonial policies of Britain in giving legitimacy to his ruling sovereignty caused the construction of the Aryan race illusion and the glory of the Iran Aryan civilization against Semitic civilizations. Thus, the Iranians had this chance once more that the natural situation of Iran became a symbol of the human rights.

How did Zoroaster become different from the other prophets and how was he illustrated as the hero of intellectualism and enlightenment?

Unlike the German philosophers like Hegel who aimed at the interpretation and rationalization of religion, the enlightenment age was developed in against religion and church in France. Voltaire and the other intellectuals of the age of enlightenment targeted their direct criticism at the church and Christianity. They outcried their complaints in address to the church and Christ: "we must decapitate (behead) this monster out of his body and ..." the myths of the Aryan racism were simultaneously forming up. The Western intellectuals were attempting at constructing an Aryan religion in contrast to the Semitic religions of Jewish and Christianity. In this time, Thomas Hyde was the first Westerner who published a book about Zoroastrianism without travel to the East (Iran and India), the original place of Zoroastrianism and without having any original manuscript of Zoroastrian holy book at hand in 1700 in which he called Zoroastrianism as monotheism religion and he considered the polytheism view about Zoroastrianism as a distortion of the Greek historians (Boyce, 1381: 228). Content with the discovery of Hyde who bolded an Aryan prophet against the Semitic prophets, the enlightenment philosophers defined Zoroaster as the hero of philosophy and the philosopher of the lights in line with him (Shaibani in Dehbash, 1388: 511). Zoroaster became the hero of the light for the

philosophers (the same: 523). The reason for the interest of Waltaire, the philosopher of the light, in Zoroaster was that Waltaire: " saw Zoroaster as the old-est reformer and teacher of the ethics" (the same: 526).

Then, Enctil Dopron asked for research about Zoroaster religion. They promised Eniktil the support of the minster and king's representative in Indian Company and Academy and ... . While returning to France, they welcomed him warmly but this warm welcome was followed by a terrible incident (the same: 541). All the Enhland and Germn research-ers and orionalists and encyclopedia writers turned against him ( the same: 543). " Enektil proved to be the girst person who has translated Avesta and has given the first manuscript to the royal library ... the rests were subsidiary and counterfeit. Anktil introduced Zoroastrianism as a polytheism, backwarded and infected with superstition religion in op-position to Hiads' views (Boyce, 1381: 229). His research not only blemished the ideal image which Haid depicted from Zoroaster as a ethical monotheism prophet without any rituals, but also he presented Zoroastrianism as polytheism with customs, rites and sactifice. There-fore, the western Aryan intellectuals who were ebullient about discover-ing an intellectual prophet against the semitic prophets targeted their attacks at Eniktil.

William James, one of the first theorists of the Indo-European lsguages wrote: "the clumsiest imposter people cannot write such nonsense words, like the Anictil book, about Zoroaster. ThebZoroaster might not have had the ccoomon sense . . . or the book might not have been his own book ..., then the book ascribed to him is the expression of lies and concoctions, you have decieved the people andbyou deserve the con-tempt of the socuety. You lack the knowlege and your work is absurd and useless (Shaibani, the same: 546). William Jones bitter reaction was supported by the English orionalists and he admitted his accusations in 1789. Stating that there has remained no version of the Iranian primary languge, John Richardson concirded with Aniktil1777. Marinz pub-lished three momentos about Zoroaster. There, he announced that the books Aniktil has brought it from India are neither from Zoroaster nor from the ancient age (the same: 546). Felixia Redal repeated the same Jones' abuses against Aniktil. He considered it a mere illusional book composed based on the any non-existant manuscripts nowhere. Hoa, the bishop of Oransh said that Zoroaster was a legendary personality, how could he write a book? Aniktil succumbed or gave in. He resisted alone believing in his work. The encyclopedia members were also among the opponents (the same: 548). Didro in the article of "the Par-sians" wrote: "Zand is not the composition of Zoroaster but it is related to the Ozip time, the bishop of Caesaria", Shaob writes in this way: "then, the angers and hatreds of the English orionalists, who were the obvious enemies of Anictil and they expected him to have brought a weapon against religion, turned into the sever animosity when they real-izedbthat he has sought a weapen in favour of the religin (Shaob, quot-ed from Shaibani, the same: 548). Writing an article named " Zoroaster in philesophical sphere" in 1764, Woltaire came to the scene of this ar-gument and he wrote ironically in address to Aniktil: " the old Doctor Haid was more aware of the Mazdayasna religion than the passengers of the future and he had found out about the Iranian language in the Cyrus time in the west of England (the same: 549). Waltaire saw the Anictil' writing as the imagination. Therefore, the members of the ency-clopedia can not consider a man whose discovery of Zoroaster can not be utilized as a tool to deteriarate and remove Jesus and Moses more than a traitor and a naive(the same: 550). They had nothing to do with the origin of Zoroaster; Zoroaster wad only an instrument for them to destroy Jedus and Moses and they constructed Ahora of Zoroadtet against the Evil of the Jesus. Milen ...

regarded Aniktil as a wild man in 1798 ... who can not be approached. He has the Rausaw's disyrust and Diogenes' violence simultaneously (the same: 550). Didraw wrote: Do not believe ... this matter Aniktil says that he has endured the hardship of the journey and being far away from the family just for the sake of the truth ... he is seditious and ... (the same: 550). The members of the France encyclopedia did not defend and support Anikti against English critical attacks at all. Describing Zand in a letter in the republic of literature, he wrote: "this is a threevolumed untidy mass which nobody could read and understand". In line with Jones, Grim condemned An-iktil and considered him as deserving the same sharp criticisms of Jones (the same: 551). Therefore, the western intellectuals, who expected Zoroaster as a tool to demolish the semitic religions and Aniktil did not fulfil their expectations, attacked Aniktil acidly and called him as evil, wild and twaddler. They were still trying to bold the image of Zoroas-ter as an Aryan prophet against Moses, Jesus and Mohamnad. They constructed an advanced and inteletual religion from Zoroastrianism in contrast to the semitic religions. Further, the Iranian intellectuals like PourDswood, DostKhah and ... imposed the ideology of the western intellectuals in an immitative manner on their history instead of acquiring correct knowledge about the history, religion and the culture of their own nation. However, this positive image about Zoroaster could not stay for a long time since Aniktil has put its own impact and his re-sources were more original than that of the others. Herder, Teachson and Hirin defended him. Herder said: "before Aniktil, everybody was speaking of Zoroaster but they had not read his books ... Aniktil's book must be studied by any reader from every nation". Bornef and Mish-laalso voiced their support for Aniktil (the same: 657). Since the criticisms and attacks of the intellectuals towards Aniktil and the boycott of him and his books could not prevent the influence of his writings, they resorted to another trick to preserve the purity of the Aryan prophet: they made the dustbin of the Median Mages. As Waltaire's expectation to find support from Aniktil was not fulfilled, he lost hope in him and he called his book as an untidy and hateful mass towards Zoroaster. He, in line with Didro and ..., considered the religion of the ancient Iranians as an instinctive and logical religion which has been deteriorated as the result of the obscurantism and the bigotry of the Mages (553). Thus, the myth of the distortion of the Zoroaster religion by the Mages was formed. They separated the old parts of Avesta, the Gots, from the rest of Avesta while what assumed as the old Zoroastrianism Aves-ta is mainly the constructio of the western reserchers from the 19th century onwards (Skiro in Kirtis, 1390: 76). They called the Mages as the corruptors of the Zoroastrianism disregarding all the historical documents that the Mages were the original Zoroasyrian clerics and the protectors of it. It was the first time in history that the Mages and Zoroaster became separated not as the result of the historical research but the power of the Aryanism ideology. Even though, Herodutes had said the the Mages were Median, he had not made any indication concerning the contradiction of the Mages with Zoroaster religion and all the historians contemporary with Herodutes unanimously agree that the Mages were Zoroastrian and Zoroaster was the chief of the Mages. The reason behind the formation of the distortion theory of Zoroastrianism by the Mages was the revelation of the Zoroastrianism real nature by Depron. The researchers wanted to acquit Zoroaster religion and put the the responsibility of the violence and backwardedness of this religion on the shoulders of the Mages. William Jones, whose writings was a reaction against Depron's real image of Zoroaster and ancient Iran, was the first person who constructed the theory of Indo-European languages. The wave of Iraneology was basically developed in contrast to and for the negation of Depron's ideas about Zoroaster and Iran; hence, the plural Iran was constructed along with the philosophers and the saviors of Zoroaster and Cyrus and the

normal situation of Iran changed into a civil Iran with a past magnificent civilisation. Nonetheless, neither Zoroaster was different from prophets like Moses, Jesus and Mohammad, nor Cyrus and Darius from the kings like Taimor and Changiz nor Achaemenid system from Safavids. The constructed truth of the Iranian world is a latter form molded on the old matter.

This issue that the Iranian intellectuals regard the ancient Iran as the symbol and the origin of the human right, and the unity in plurality, and Cyrus as the symbol of freedom, and Zoroaster as the symbol of wisdom, is rooted in the old myths of king-worshipping and the new myths of Aryanism and has no scientific value. As the old historians like Xenophon, who was the student of Socrates, the greatest enemy of democracy and the fan of monarchy, expressed their hates towards the Greek democracy through praising Iranian kingdom, the new historians like Gobineau in the same way as Xenophon were disappointed of the racial unity of the Aryans as seen in the war between Persians and Franks and their racial analysis of the French revolution, which they considered it as the rite of low class people against the superior race of the Franks which were Germans. These issues caused them to present and bold the theory of the greater glorious ancient Iran and Aryanism. What we said about Zoroaster before is quite true about the history of the whole Iran; besides, this matter that the ancient Iran as the symbol of human rights, freedom and pluralism was the construction of the western racist intellectuals and its copying of the Iranian archaism idiomologues taken from Ferozian, Pourdavoud, Taghizadeh, Minoie to Shojadin Shafa, Abdolhosain Zarinab, and Fridon Adamiyat. This ideology was the direct product of the British colonialism, the Disraeli's policy in giving legitimacy to the British empire, a reaction against Semitic religions, and the writings like the critical views of Anikst Dopron.

Sir John Malakom founded the analytic and theoretical base of archaistic nationalism on the history of Iran. Sir John Malakom was the broker of concluding the colonial contracts in the era of Fath Ali Shah-e Gajar and he was an extremely anti-Islam person. Perhaps he is the first who has presented the foundations of the delusions like "the glory of the ancient Iran", "the destruction of the Iranian sciences by the Muslims", and this point that Islam has caused the backwardness of Iran. His main aim of presenting these ideas was to make a distance between the Iranians and their Islamic identity through highlighting a delusional and badness issue called "Aryan Identity". The western Iranological studies culminated in 1970s at the same time of the reactions against Perdon and which was concurrent with the premiership of Disraeli who was the theoretician of the British empire in the world. He posed up this view that the large British empire can not rule out merely based on coercion and violence. Thus, people must have real penchant (inclination) for the great England. He carried out this plan through fabricating ideology which was the same ideology of Aryanism.

However, things did not end in here, the Disraeli's policies and the Aryan racism atmosphere in the west only constructed a bright and intellectual history of Iran and not an Iranian, national concentrated, and supranational governance. Moreover, this time it was the turn of German's colonial policies which constructed the idea of the national sovereignty and Iranian government.

Despite the rapid economic growth, Germany lacked colonial influence in the Middle East after the Berlin congress. Due to the weakness of the Gajar, the dominated countries (Iran) as the bridge between the west and the east were under the influence of England and Russia, two of the German opponents.

Germany was trying to free the dominated lands out of the control of England and Russia with the help of the orientalist like Hertsfield so as to establish his influence in that region. Since Germany did not have the possibility of carrying out the military operation, it presented a plan to formulate the national sovereignty and a central government in Iran. The prerequisite for the formation of a central national government was the propagation of the idea of the national sovereignty and nationalism by which they constructed the history of Iran by sending the orientalist like Hertsfield; it was a national history with the powerful governance of Cyrus and Darius and with a national army which had under its dominance from India up to Egypt. This was a kind of national history with the powerful empire of Cyrus and Darius and Artaxerxes and with a national army which was destroyed by the Arabs and also with Ghaznia that was a shameful badge on the forehead of the pre-Islamic governments. The promulgation of nationalism must not have been restricted to the Fars areas since the northern part was under the control of Russia and the southern and western part were under the ruling of England at that time?; thus, nationalism must have involved all the constructed borders of other ethnic groups so as to decrease the influence of Russia and England. In this way, they constructed the idea of the national sovereignty of the superethnic Iran; they formulated the thinking foundation of the modern state of Reza Shah and the thinking nutrition of nationalists like Pirnia, Feroz, Akhondzadeh, Jalaladdin Farsi, and ... through constructing the old history of Arya and propagating Iranian nationalism.

It was for the same reason that Hertsfield proposed the promulgation of the word "Iran" instead of Pars to Reza Shah so that the central government could be extended to the dominated lands and the German-advocating central government could end the infiltration of the England and Russia. This led to the construction of Iran, the national history of Iran, that is, Shahnama, the national army of Cyrus and Darius, the enlightenment hero of Zoroaster, the Iranian being of Zoroaster, and ... in the modern historiography. Thus, the modern government of Reza Shah was rooted in spreading the ideas that were constructed by orientalist like Hertsfield commissioned based on the colonial interests of Germany and the nationalists supporters of Reza Shah fostered it and made it as the legitimate - giving to the national state (Jenkin, 2011: 7- 14). The national Iranian sovereignty and nationalism necessitated a soul, the soul that would stay beyond the failures and political fluctuations; hence, Hertsfield put up Zoroaster as the Iranian national soul in the narrative center of Iran.

### The historiography of the Kurd

To write the history of the Kurd, we must renounce relying on the absolute facts; the archaeology of silence must be attended to. We must extract the distinctive history of the Kurd out of the history of Iranism, Islamism, Arabism, and ... . We must eliminate the dust and the foliage of the Iranism and Islamism history on the traces of the Kurd's history. political marginalization of the Kurds is the reflection of our marginalization in contents of the history. The contents of the historical texts is the same as the inscriptions of the kings. Since the Kurds have not been victorious in the history, they did not have any shares in the historical contents. The courtier history are those like Baihaghi, Rashidaddin, and ... whom they have focused on conquests and mega narratives of the kings. It is for this reason that the titles of the historical books is Khodai

Nama, Dhah Nama or Saro - al Molok (the characteristics of the kings); however, the Kurds have not been the conquerors and the kings, so they have not had any shares in these historical books.

In the above, we pointed out how the western historiography was to benefit the Persians and to the detriment of the Kurds. We are present in historical texts only on the margins and footnotes. To write an independent text of Kurd's history, we must collect thousands of margins and footnotes of the conquerors texts so that we can write an independent text for the Kurd. Therefore, to write the history of the Kurd, we should not be confine ourselves to a few sources . The composition of an independent text of the Kurd history is an onerous work and to have the sweets, you must first have the sour. We must try to deconstruct the conquerors texts so as to discover and recover an independent identity and history for the Kurds out of the paradoxes, contradictions, malignity of their texts, and the inversion of the dual oppositions of the historical texts. The Kurds must be brought from the margin of history to the content, then they can reach the source of power from the fringe of the politics. The feeling and conviction of the Kurds being are very strong among the Kurds, but there is no cognition and knowledge behind it. It is only with the help of the science of history and the re-vival of identity and a distinct history the the feeling of being the Kurd will be transformed into knowledge. There the instinct of being the Kurd must be changed into the knowledge and cognition.

The Kurds' writings can be divided into two parts. Most of the older writings and the classic writers merely would focus on the history and cite the events, with no backing of thought. Most of the intellectuals and young writers of today are either engaged in journalistic analyses or they are involved in the placeless contemplation and the abstractions of Hegel, Hubber Mas, Marx, and Foucault. These two approaches are use-ful when they are together; if we cannot present a synthesis of historical events and philosophical thoughts, our thought will be limited to the mere mentioning and repetition of historical events as well as the place-less abstractive thought. In the libraries, there are a great deal of books under the rhapsody title of the Kurd and Kurdistan history written on their cover, but alas, there exists nothing but the historical event that can be found in any book. These books, which mostly dealt with the history of the clans and the tribes, have actually focused on historical events and have not been able to move beyond the mere mentioning of the events. The historical knowledge is – as Drobzen-intellection. The his-tory is the relationship between the subject and the object, the subject that lies within the history itself. The historical events have external ex-istence and they are embodied in the mind of the author, which are in-ternalized and thoughtful. The work of the historian is not scientific, but it is commentary and understanding. The understanding of historical research is not an objective image of what has happened but reconstruc-tion of our image and interpretation of the events. The history does not relate to events and the mentioning of the events. The history – as Col-lingood says - deals with the actions, i.e. events behind which there is a sort of thought; the history is due to the political action rather than the instinctive actions of nomads. The history of the clans and tribes is the history of history-less Kurdistan. The actions of the tribes are not mere actions but the reactions, and it is a soulless substance which no thoughts have scribed on it. Therefore, the study of clans and tribes is only

mentioning the event and repetition of cliché while history deals with concepts and knowledge rather than with instinct.

On the one hand, if you study the more modern writings on the Kurds, they are either journalistic analyses, or most of them are concerned with the ideas of Huber Mas, Pooper and Marx, and discourse analysis. There is no doubt that we are like the blind without Western thoughts and it is impossible to make any kind of analytic history without Western ideas. Western ideas can only provide the theoretical and conceptual framework for the history analysis. The Greeks once said that logic is not thought, but the instrument of thinking, now Western thoughts are like the logic for us, and they are the tools of our thinking and analysis and interpretation of our history. Theories of great scholars like Marx and Foucault have come from the heart of the history and societal transformations of those societies, and we cannot deal with those thoughts in an abstract way and we cannot study them without adapting it to the societal transformations and comparing it with the transformations in our own history. We must use Western ideas to interpret our own history. We need to be immersed in the air capsule of Western thoughts in the ocean of the history.

The main problem of the Kurd is neither service nor betrayal, but separation of theory and practice. We are not aware or conscious of our political existence. We are in an intellectual vacuum that, as a nearly headless (beheaded) rooster, we try to resort to the baseless political ideologies and slogans. In order to become conscious and to convert the consciousness and the feeling of being the Kurd into knowledge and consciousness, we have to philosophize about the history. Self-awareness does not develop in vacuum. The requisite of the national and political self-awareness is the historical self-awareness. Thus, we must recover the soul compatible with the political existence and action of the Kurd from the heart of history. We must deconstruct and break the historical textual walls of the conquerors. The new-born of the Kurd will mature only through the marriage of philosophy and the history.

The hegemony of metaphysics in history has led to the disappearance of Kurds history. The Kurds themselves have not written the history, nor does the Kurds have history from the metaphysical mentality, that is, the Iranian / Semitic and Western mentality- because there has not existed a metaphysics- to be in need of religion and philosophy or the Kurd history has been limited to mentioning the events of the native tribes and clans, while the history of the Kurdish thought must be written. Collingood considers history as the history of thought and the whole history as the rehearsal of the past thought in the mind of the historian him/herself (Collingood, 1389: 273). The processes of the history are not the mere events, such as the events of nature, but they are the action processes that have an internal aspect involving the thinking processes and the work of the historian is finding these thought processes" (the same: 273). Therefore, the history is not a serial story or a description of the transformation that the Kurds historians be involved in. "contrary to the scientists in the fields of the natural sciences, the historian do not deal with events in the precise meaning of the word; he deals with events that are the external expression of thought. Thus, the events are the external expression of the thought and the thoughts constitute the logically continuous concepts behind the chained events. The historian is after the thoughts and their external manifestations in the events. These events happens in time. However, they are not in time ... the time does not change them. The happening of the fact at the time does not make it historical, but knowing it as the fact is rethinking the same thought on our side" (the same: 276). The Kurd historians, unfortunately,



either mention incidents which are always repeated in history, such as natural disasters, eating, fighting, and the struggle among the tribes, or their repression by the others. Thus, they name their books as the history of Kurd and Kurdistan, unaware that the historian works with events that are the external manifestation of the thoughts. The events that historians have recorded as "the history of historyless no-mads" of the Kurd or the description of the Kurds dynasties events without understanding their logic and repetition can also be recorded from the animals lives, i.e. the war between hyenas and seasonal migration of the animals and .... While history deals with human actions, the actions that are the external manifestation of the human beings. The history deals with the thought and recreation of thought in the historian's mind, but not the thought that had been transferred- as based on the philosophers of the soul- through the mind and the religious / philosophical concepts and by the elites of the society. The history pays tribute to the deeds of the mankind (Collingood), a thought which has realized itself through actions; this thought is the non- censored and real thoughts of the human beings. Therefore, to save history from an abstract conception of the soul philosophers, from one side, and from the historians who, like empirical sciences, merely mention the events and write the history of the instinctive actions of the Kurd nomads, there must be written the history of conscious actions and political action of the Kurd. In conclusion, the distinct spirit of a nation and a certain history of a nation cannot be acquired from the deeds of the tribes. For the recognition of the Kurd history, neither should we look for the religious / mythological implications of the Kurds as the defenders of Islam ... and consider the existence of the Kurds as consigned by the actions, which are the same among all nations. The history of the Kurd and the existence of the Kurd is determined through its political action rather than tribal deeds. The tribal deed is not the external representation of thought, but it is a natural reaction to events.

The historic deeds of the Kurd should be sought in less repeatable political movements – not like the actions of the continuously repeatable nomads, which are based on the negation of metaphysics such as the movements of Khoramdinan, Mazdakids, and Zanakids. The historian has to know what they have inferred from such an action and what they have thought (the same: 150). Therefore, to recognize the existence of, the Kurds, we should know what the Kurds were thinking about that made them as different from other nations leading to different historical behaviour. What viewpoints have the Kurds ontologically/epistemologically towards the existence, the world and human beings which have been different from those of other nations. The mind - set of Iranian / Semitic nations can be understood through their writings, religion, and culture. In the absence of culture, the history of the Kurd must be recognized through their political uprisings. Only a historian is able to write the history of the Kurd who can go through the appearance of the Kurd political/historical deeds and discover the logic behind those actions, that is, the rational concepts that political movements are their external manifestation. These are the interrelated logical concepts that created and actually shaped the history of the Kurd and his real existence. These are the concepts that make the history of the Kurd. If the Kurds, with a philosophical understanding, do not recognize the earlier implications of history, the history of the Kurd would be the history of the historyless tribes and clans and it would be the mere mentioning of the incidents. The problem that most of the historians encounter is engaging in mentioning the outside events. The most significant concepts that have made up the political mind-set of the Kurd are liberty (the rejection of the political guardian whether the metaphysical or moral), that is, the same Mithra (contract/Paradise). The Paradise means the negation of the metaphysical and moral guardians, and contract is the same as the rejection of

political guardians and liberty indicates the re-pulsion of foreign sovereignty. If we scan the history of the Kurd, we can notice that it has always been engaging in the repulse of the foreign domination and the realization of the internal sovereignty from the era of the Persian Achamanids up to Abbasids, Turks, Mogols and the arti-ficial contemporary governments. The Kurds have not arrived to the second stage but the concept behind which has been the existential cause of all the uprisings.

Therefore, the first request of the Kurds is the political action related to the repulse of the external domination which necessitates the realization of internal sovereignty and legislation itself. The concepts of which are anti - class justice, earthly/contractual and the Dionysus anti - cultural legitimacy.

A general classification of the Kurd history based on the concept of Mithra (contract/paradise)

The Political emancipation of the Kurd is not possible except by histori-cal self - awareness, and to do so we must do the conceptualization of the Kurd history; the conceptualization of the Kurd history is not likely except in the form of a general theory of history . For the present, we do not have the conceptual possibilities for the reconstruction of the Kurd-ish history in the form of a general theory or at least I (the author) do not have such a scholastic ability. There are many dark angles of the Kurd history, and the action and reaction of neighbouring peoples with the Kurd; hence, the representation of any theory in this regard is no more than a hypothesis until further data will be collected. We have al-ready classified the Kurds history into the ancient, middle and contem-porary period which is consistent with the general division of history, not the Kurd history. If we want to classify the history of the Kurd, we can divide it into four periods.

The first period (Mithra: contract/paradise) extends from the Medes up to Gaumates and Ferawartish in which both theory and practice are the same. That is to say, both the logic of the Kurdish action, with the aforementioned components as well as the classical ethnic selfawareness (not the national and modern nationalist self-awareness) in Kurdish movements. The Medes were aware of their distinct from other ethnic groups and they identified themselves as distinct ethnic group with their specific symbols and language, as well as the identity-seeking components such as: freedom (biology and political) and equality jus-tice, contractual democracy, erotic culture, and ... . This unity of theory and practice continues up to the era of Gaumates and Ferawartish. In fact, Mithra/contract is the negation of the political guardian and inter-nal contract and Mithra/paradise is terrestrial and erotic culture.

The second period (Mihtra/paradise) of the Kurd history begins with the Mazdak and ends with Khoramdinan in which the logic of the Kurd action is still continuing with the aforementioned components, but its ethnic consciousness is either fragmented, or because of the lack of neutral resources and the loss of resources, we know nothing about it. It is the duty of the historian to internalize what was external in these movements and make it self - conscious.

As the historian is not merely the spectator, the historian has recon-structed what has happened in history inside his mind, and s/he has in-ternalized and has made what is unconscious and instinctive in the form of his own concepts. In this period, the Kurds have demonstrated their differentiation in the form of class concepts, and in the form of symbol-ic war of the general

concepts. Ethnic self - awareness gives place to a instinctive and symbolic distinction. Mitra / paradise is the undisputed principle of Mazdak and Khoramdin movements. In Mazdak, the contract has still remained, but in Khoramdinan, the priority has been given to Mithra/paradise and Mithra/contract has come to the verge of the oblivion, unaware that Mithraparadise is only significant in the frame-work of Mithra/contract.

The third period of the Kurd (Mitra/Zarathustra) starts after the Khoramdinan period which can be cited as the decay period. During this period which includes the beginning of modern nationalism, as far as we know about the history, the logic of the Kurds action of modern nationalism with the mentioned components has been gone into the abyss of oblivion and the Kurdish movements have been manifested in the cover of religion and gnosticism and there is no news of their ethnic self-awareness and they have shown their own distinction with religious and tribal expression. In this period, the political action of the Kurd have been impregnated with the Iranian thought. We try to interpret kurdish symbols from the angle of Iranian / mystical vision, as in mysti-fied Mithra Thus, the main subject of the historiography of the Kurdish deterioration period was the mysticism and mystification of Mithra which the Kurds are still entangled in it and also replying to this ques-tion why the Kurdish modern nationalism was born out of the Takyas (the shrine of mysticism followers). If the main subject of the first histo-riography period of the Kurd is Mithra/contract components along with the Mede as its ethnic form, the main subject of the second period is Mithra/paradise without the Mede ethnicity. Moreover, the main subject of the third historiography period of the Kurd is the deterioration era of the Iranian/mystified Mithra and the transition from the epic and trage-dy to mysticism and non-action, when there is no news of the Mede ethnic consciousness nor the former contract/paradise Mithra. In the pe-riod of decline, the ethnic self - awareness and his differentiation from the other was forgotten and then it has been displayed in the form of religion or religious minority. For example, in confronting the Shia Iran, the Kurds showed themselves as Sunni Muslims and they had tendency towards Ottoman Sunnis. In this period, they expressed their distinction not consciously, but instinctively and symbolically. in contrast to Sa-favids dynasty, Ghaderia mysticism, which is close to Shia and Sufism of Safavids, have given its place to Naghshbandia which defined itself as against Shia and esoteric mysticism. If the Iranians stress on Nowruz, the Kurds settled on the borders of Iran celebrate the feast of sacrifice (Ghorban), but the Kurds in Turkey and Iraq tend to celebrate Newroz more to demonstrate their distinction there; thus, they have shown themselves in the symbolic and imaginary level and not in the form of self - conscious concepts, let alone that the paradise/contract Mithra has given its place to the Iranian fabricated Mithra. In fact, there is not only no news of ethnic self - awareness in this period, but also the compo-nents of the Kurd logic are wrapped in the cloak of mysticism and reli-gion or sometimes they are totally forgotten. The importance of the Khoramdinan insurgency lies in that the tragic act of the Kurds gives way to submission mysticism; besides, the Kurdish nationalism, which is derived from the mysticism, has a paradox in its heart, the paradox of the tragic revolve along with the submission of mysticism. The Kurds are rioting in practice but they are surrendering or submitting in front of the same totality that they are trying to destroy in theory. They are practically are after the breakage of the totality, for example (the totality of Iran), which they are their captive in theory.

The fourth period (the reversed contract Mithra and discrete from para-dise) of the Kurd history appears with the beginning of modern nation-alism, which I name under the title of the revival

of incomplete Kurdistan or a form of content-less nationalism which consists of ethnic self-awareness, but some traces of its content, which is the same logic of the Kurdish action, has instinctively remained only from it, or is sometimes completely forgotten. Because of political self-awareness, Mithra / contract has an unconscious but reversed intangible presence but Mithra / paradise is discrete of the political action and is inhabited in poetry and literature. There has occurred a conflict between Kurdish political movements and Mithraian identity. From one side, Mithra/ contract has been turned upside down, each Kurdish party has friendly agreement with the others but makes animosity with another Kurdish party instead of agreeing with each other; in the other side, Mithra/ paradise has been split from politics but involved in literature. In writing contemporary history, and for realizing contiguous Mithra (contract/paradise), we must analyze the folklore paradise-like spirit and the contractual spirit of politics in a dialectical relationship with each other in order to combine a synthesis of it with ethnic self-awareness.

Modern nationalism saved the form of the Kurdistan from being declined, but at the expense of sacrificing the contents of the nationalism Kurdish quest for identity. Modern Kurdish nationalism that is an imitation of the imported nationalism of neighbouring nations is "useless" and it has adopted the Western abstract concepts, regardless of the indigenous reality; thus, it has forgotten the historical existence of the Kurd. Through forgetting the distinction of the Kurd history, nationalism sees the Kurd question like that of other nations in the form of abstract and moral concepts such as the right to determine destiny and ... to fulfil the right. The nationalism of the stateless nations, which is under the domination cannot be a legal nationalism, which does the self-assertion in the form of the right to determine the destiny, moral innocent-playing or participation and citizenship. The Kurd Nationalism is only the form and its content must be inferred from the distinguished history of the Kurd nation. However, not paying attention to the distinctive history of the Kurd, being aware of the Kurd historiography has fallen into the abyss of the useless well through mentioning the events and the history-less history of the tribes. Therefore, the Kurds quest for identity in the future must revive the components of the history of the Kurds quest- for identity while preserving the ethnic self-awareness and emphasizing on the national elements such as language, land and independence so as the theory and practice together can provide the ground for role-playing the history of the Kurd. Nationalism is the form of Kurdistan and Mithra (paradise/contract) is its content.

Thus, the main subject of Kurdish historiography is Mithra (contract / paradise). In the ancient period of Mithra, contract / paradise were along each other, the politics was based on the social and terrestrial contract and there was no split between God/individual and government/community. In the middle period, god/government was separated from the individual and went up to the sky and paradise retreated to the folkloric hidden homes, too. i.e. . the middle period of god / government broke away from earth and went to the sky and the campus also retreated into the house and the inside. The Iranian mystified Mithra took the place of Median Mithra and Kurdistan became the site of placeless mysticism. In the contemporary period, thanks to nationalism, God / Government, i.e. Mithra/contract returned to the earth but in a reversed form, that is, having animosity together and friendship and contract with the others, paradise has been still constrained to the folkloric concealed homes and the split of politics/God has remained with paradise/heaven.

### Conclusion:

The purpose of this study, in addition to criticizing the dominance of the Iranian political wisdom over the Kurds' quest for identity, is to identify the untold components of the Kurdish identity and the main reason behind the contradiction of the Iranism with Kurdism and to understand the secret of the permanent revolt of the Kurds, in the form of concepts and proposing a theoretical framework for reconstructing the history of the Kurdish thought. However, we presented the discussion more than merely stating the events in a way that the root of the problems was not limited to the contemporary period, but to a more distant era. Thus, we analyzed the events from the mythical eras until the end of the Sasanian period and Mazdakids revolt in this first volume of the book which is related to the ancient time. In fact, in this book, we tried to make a general outline of the Kurd history, and to explain the place of the Kurds in history, and the reaction of the Iranian political wisdom against it. We found that history is not based either on desire, or on fate, and the stimulus behind it is not accident, but these are principles and concepts that are governing the developments of the history and the confrontation of Iran and Kurd are the contradiction of concepts and principles.

Most of the views on the Kurds are limited to the mention of the event or the journalistic slogans or the discussion of thought without relating to the indigenous reality, or derived and copied clumsily from the writing of the others, and looking at its own history from the angle of the others. Our emphasis is that such views are not able to articulate the issue of the Kurd, and it is impossible to analyze the Kurd issue with ethical slogans, journalistic discussions, and abstract plans. Nevertheless, we should look at the Kurd issue with regard to the relation of thought to the indigenous reality through a historical look since no significant work has been done in this domain. Therefore, the author had to look at the lived experience of the Kurd directly during the long history without the intermediaries of the concepts; hence, he deduced the concepts using various sources. For this reason, the possibility of a dialogue between my point of view and those of other historians was not possible because we basically have no historian in the real sense. There has been presented no tangible viewpoint on the history of Kurds, which has made himself mentally engaged in and criticizing it. We went directly to historical reality and tried empirically under a theoretical framework to reconstruct the history of the Kurd and the action and the reaction of the Iranian / historical political reason against it. Although the book is theoretical / philosophical, I have presented the theory in the form of objective analysis and historical facts, and as far as I have been able, I have expressed my views in the form of others theories, and I have covered myself in the back scene of a historical facts that the use of the countless resources and facts does not question the theoretical being of the book. There were no easy roads to pave it to enter the world of theory. Every one who is after finding the truth can get the author's theory in the midst of resources and facts.

The fundamental movement of all ideologies are positively evaluated precisely based on rigid and inflexible dual oppositions between self or familiar and outsiders or alien, which is casted beyond the boundaries of understanding. The good ethical codes versus evil codes are the most significant pattern of this principle. Ideology is a form of thought sameness that transforms the

uniqueness and variety of the things into their mere similarity, or it expells them beyond their own borders in a panic - driven move. The political wisdom of Iran, in its attempts to equalize and create a good Iranian Kurd, demonstrates a non-Iranianized Kurd as evil and demon and rejects him or her as the element of the alien forces. The Kurds are the other of the Iranian political thought. The other, although absent in appearance, is inserted within it as an outstanding delayed meaning. The other of Iran, i.e. the Kurd, exists as an invisible but working element. Iran's political reason has achieved its meaning through discriminating between itself and the Kurds, which are supposed not to exist. The Iranian civilization has defined an Iranianized Kurd as a good Kurd and a non-Iranianised Kurd as out of his mind by splitting the concept of the Kurd, it inadvertently contributes to their understanding of meaning while there does not exist sameness between the Iranian political thought and the Kurds. Iranian political reason is the same politics and the sovereignty of Iranism, which is why the opposite of Iranian (and ideology) is rooted in the sovereignty of the Iranian state, and the truth of the Iranian government is rooted in the ethnic Persians dominance over the Kurds. There, there does not exist the possibility of dialogue to solve the Kurd's issue and obtain its rights within the framework of the Iranian political reason which is the justifier of the one-ethnic Iranian government as the conveyer of the benefits of the Persians and their sovereignty over the Kurds.

Within the framework of classical philosophy, which was an manifestation of objective life, the sameness identity was defined and the plural and marginalized identities were articulated around the content and central themes. However, in the new philosophy, the ground was paved for the emergence of the margin and self- announcement in contrast to the content with the collapse of the central and meta narratives, including the meta narratives of the nation- state. Here, we intend to present the theoretical foundations stating the split from the classic philosophy and meta-narratives in order to explain the marginal identities and the negation of the abstract signifiers, and in order to express the lifeworld against the systemic world. In fact, criticizing the political reason of Iran was the critique of Iranian thoughtful dictatorship and the critique of the Persian ruling class/ethnicity over the lifeworld of the Kurd. The historical/political identity of the Kurds is illustrated not in the form of the soul philosophy but in the form of life philosophy in the framework of social / political acts of the riots such as Gaumates, Ferawartish, Mazdak, Khoramdinan and the contemporary movements. The identity elements of such riots such as freedom, being terrestrial, earthly / contractual legitimacy, equality justice and in sum Mithra (contract/paradise) was the reversal of the ancient world. The ancient thought up to pre – modernism era, with giving the priority to the spirit, heaven, religion and reason, was the negation of the identities which was manifested in the historical movements of the Kurd; hence, the Kurds, who did not give in to the logic and the symbolic order of the old world, were doing unusual habits and they were outcast to the margins of the civilization with badges such as evil, goblin and dragons in the truth sovereignty of the old thought.

However, the theoretical background of liberating the Kurds from under the heavy machine of Iranian/Semitic political wisdom and the whole history was released through transition from the ancient thought to the new thought, i.e. through transition from the soul to the object, the sky to the ground, Logos to Eros, the content to the margin and ..., which our aim in presenting

the comprehensive theoretical framework was to provide a theory suitable to the logic of the Kurd action, and to combine modern western philosophy with the reality of the logic of the native action of the Kurd. Presenting any theory about Kurds without theoretical support is nothing but mentioning the events and it inevitably will not go beyond the slogan, because history does not refer to events, but to actions, actions that are the manifestation of thought. Presenting a general theory about history without conceptualization is, in fact, milking the ram. The representation of concepts is not the creation or molding of an abstract theory, but rather it is uttering the logic of the Kurdish action. The absence of concepts in the past did not mean the lack of contents. The concepts must be based on actual and documented bases. The concepts must be deduced from core of the social/political actions of the Kurd with an interpretative perspective. Although, there is no concept expression the living experience of the Kurds completely, we must try to uphold the sensations and beliefs in Kurd-ism to the level of knowledge and concepts. We must bring what we have expressed through the language of the feeling or what we have merely believed in it up to the level of episteme and consciousness. However, this is an onerous action that we should do our best to carry it out.

The results obtained from this research indicate that the bases of the Iranian knowledge are instruments in the service of the superior ethnicity/class of the Persians, whether in the form of myth, religion, ideology and even concepts such as nationality, multi-ethnic Iran, and .... The Kurds are not only Iranian / Aryan, but the basis of Iranism, from the racial, territorial and cultural / political viewpoints, have been developed in confrontation, negation and marginalization of Kurds and their land and identity. Iranian religion and mythology, political culture and its military empire, Iranian territory and civilization could not be developed and continued except by denying and deactivating and the other making of the Kurds. The ancient Zoroastrianism religion could not emerge and flourish except by negation and elimination and the other making of the of Mithra, the ancient religion of the Kurds, and the Median Mithra became notorious as Ahriman (Demon) in Zoroastrianism. "The other" and the Aniran or nonIranian of the Iranian mythology, Turanians, Ajdahak, Ahriman (devil), and Dave, which carry the memory of Iranians many years' struggle with their enemies in the conquest of land, are the same Kurds and their rituals. The Persian/Achamainids empire, which was the instrument of the ethnic domination of the Persians, did not form and develop except with the military defeat and the suppression and marginalization of the Medes/Kurds empire. Even the symbols and works of the Iranian such as Persepolis and Bistoon inscription are the reminiscent of their victories on the Kurds. In addition, the Persian language was created to preserve the memory of the Persians victories over the Medes by the Elamite and Babylonian scribes on Bistoon inscriptions overnight under the order of Darius. The Iranian government has been the instrument of the Iranian ethnic domination over the Medes. The Iranian totems like cow and eagle are the opposites of Kurds symbols such as lions and snakes, the greater Iran was the paradise lost of the Persian migrants in the land of the Medes where they called it as Iran via the military domination. The Persians were so clever that they covered the root of their violence of dominance over the Kurds/Medes, the Persians destructed the traces of the Medes and made them so unpopular in history, which the Kurds never erected their backs to get their rights in negating the Persians completely – in a way that the Persians did to them. The cleverness of the Persians is exemplary. They tried to construct the Medes relative with the Persians through lies such as the kinship being of Cyrus with Astiag, having a co-religion and the shared sovereignty of the Medes and the Persians along with suppression, massacre, and merciless

elimination of the Medes from above the earth and the memory of the history in such a manner that the violent root of the military/ethnic domination of the Persians over the Medes, which led to their religious, cultural and land sovereignty, cannot be revealed.

The basis of the social, political, land and cultural existence of the Persians was not possible except by the negation of the social, political and cultural existence of the Medes; any kind of admission to an independent identity of the Medes would have resulted in revealing the violent root of their sovereignty and complete negation of their own existence; thus, they did not hesitate to destroy any independent Median / Kurdish independent works and to construct an Iranian/Zoroastrian Mede/Kurds. All the imagery in the inscriptions about Cyrus' kinship with Astiag, about the shared domination of the Medes and Persians, and ...aimed at destroying the real picture of the relationship between Pars and Medians. The Persians destroyed the Median Mithra and constructed the false Zoroastrian Mithra in the meaning of sun-worshipping which was completely anti-Mithraism, and they made it eternal in history so that their secrets was revealed only after twenty centuries. They overthrew the Medes and registered a constructed image from the domination of the Pers over the Mede in the history, which even today the prominent historians speak of the common kinship and sovereignty of the Mede and Pers. The Persians, who were migrant tribes from the south of Russia and had no art but the militancy, confiscated the Median art, culture and their lands with the help of their violent military domination over the Medes and gave it an Iranian cover as belonging to their owns. They introduced the Medes, i.e. the main owner of this land, history, culture, and language as part of Iranian identity and culture in the memory of the history and in their own memory, too. The Kurds, in the neglect of history, viewed history from an angle of Iranian mentality and regarded themselves as part of Iranian culture and language. The Iranians destroyed the real Kurd and erected an artificial Kurd and the construction of their own image. They destroyed the true Mithra and they raised up the fabricated and Zoroastrian Mithra, as the basis of the existence of Zoroaster religion was developed in contrast to an for the animosity of the Median Mithra, the existence foundation of the Persians was formed in against and in negation of the Medes. Therefore, as the Zoroastrianism Mithra has nothing to do with the real Mithra, but it is basically and a hundred per cent contradictory to him, the Iranian constructed Kurd has nothing to do with the real Kurd, but it is contradiction of it and mostly it is the comedy aspect from the tragic origin of the Kurd.

In all the ancient times, each time a revolt was started by the Medes in which they tried to revive their power, at first, they were faced a fierce military crackdown and then cultural work and distortion.

The Kurds riots has articulated a regular expression of political demands each time, and the Persian suppressions and calm after it have expressed special political implications. The concepts expressed in the political wisdom of Iran and the Kurds quest for identity are reproduced in all actions and reactions of the related period. Therefore, beyond the scattered events and appearances of history, it is possible to understand the logic and systematic thought of these two ethnic groups.



The political wisdom of every nation is formulated in a period of time and it is codified in another time. The political wisdom of Iran was developed in line with the mentioned components with the legendary Fer-idon, the historical and Cyrus and Zoroaster in contrast to Astiag and the ritual of the Median Mithra, it was established with Darius and codified with Sasanids. The foundation of Iranian civilization began with Cyrus and the Achaemenid Empire, in which the state -Empire of Achamanids was the protector of the Persian ethnic domination over the Mede, and the Iranian political reason was a justification for the preservation of the Persian ethnic sovereignty over the Mede under the framework of representing the Persians and their leaders as good and blazoning the Medes and their leaders as evil. Iranian political wisdom continued in the ancient period with Darius and his inscription, Gaumates or the same Bardia and the Median Ferawartish replaced Zahak in the other making of the Iranian political wisdom, and Darius, the successor of Cyrus or the mythical Feridon which the Bistoon inscription of Darius shows the Iranian political reason and "non" of it as well as possible (refer to the section of the pictures). This King Darius, who represents the Persian aristocracy, takes power and knowledge from the Ahormazd (divine legitimacy and divine charisma) in the inscription, and he tramples on the Median Gaumates as non-Iranian establishing the class society again- which was destroyed by the Gaumates and continued by Ferawartish. Thus, he prevented the freedom of the Medes through reviving the Iranian state-empire which was the protector and guardian of the Persian ethnic sovereignty over the Medes. In fact, the victory of Darius against Gaumates was the triumph of Plato's justice (aristocrats) on equality justice (division of intellectual property among the public), the victory of metaphysics (Zoroasterianism and Ahura and temples) on secularism (the destruction of the temples and religion), the triumph of eastern despotism on the liberalism (the exemption of the taxes and the military services), the victory of Iranian intellect on the logic of rebels' action, and the victory of the Iranian government which was the instrument of the interests of the Persian ethnic group over the salvation of the Kurds. The two main Iranian historical / cultural symbols in the ancient period are Pasargad and Persepolis which one was built in consequence of Cyrus' victory over Ajidahak, and the other as a result of Darius' victory over Gaumates and Ferawartish. The Bistoon inscription and scribble of the Persian language were picturized on the occasion of the Persians' victory over the Median Ferawartish.

Long time after the collapse of the Achaemenid dynasty by Alexander the great, the Sasanids got the place of Achamanids with the same features, i.e. divine charisma, class distinctions and divine legitimacy. Therefore, the inscriptions of Shahpoor and Ardashir in Tagh-e Bostan replaced the inscription of Darius in Bisotun (both were the lands of the Kurds) whom they take power and knowledge from Ahormazd (divine legitimacy and charisma) and trampled Ferawartish of "the other" under their foot. The hair of the person who is under the feet of Ardashir in Naghsh-e rajas and in Naghsh-e Rostam is made of the snake; besides, what is under the feet of Ahormazd, who gives the ring of power and knowledge to the Sassanids kings, is in the shape of the snake and dragon. The other of Sassanids was the uprising of Mazdak which took place in the Mede area. The Mazdakids were spread in the areas of Dinawar, Azarbaijan and Hamadan after the massacre of Anoshirvan and the same Mazdakids were restored in the form of Khoramdinan in the time of recreating the Iranian wisdom under the political system of Abbassids. Therefore, Persian reason has been developed based on the

negation of the Kurds in the ancient period whether from the viewpoint of the political system (divine charisma and divine legitimacy against the social contract and council democracy), or from the cultural, religious (Zoroaster and Ahura against Mithraism and Serpantism) and artistic perspective (Persepolis and Pasargada in contrast to the looting of Hegmataneh); hence, the foundation of this political reason was justifying mono-ethnic government of the Persians against the Medes.

We focused only on the ancient period in this collection; though, we will continue the discussion about the Islamic Middle Ages and contemporary era. It has to be said that the original formulation of the Iranian reason initiated in Sassanian era with Khodaynameh; however, it was in the middle era and with scholars such as Ferdowsi, Nizami-Arjomand, Avicenna, and the political systems like Taherian and Samanian under the support of the Abbasids that took its final form. The ancient and mythical narratives were written and entered the political discourse in this era. With the collapse of the monarchy system of Iran via the assaults of the Muslim Arabs, the foundation of the identity of Greater Iran or the same its political reason in which the monarchy was based on class justice was dissolved; thus, there arose a crisis in the conscience of Iranism that had been shaped by the central signifier of hierarchical justice and divine charisma, described as "two centuries of silence". Through modeling of the Sassanian empire, the political system of Abbasid Islam was founded based on the political reason of Iran and Ghazali and Nizami-Arjomand constituted the concept of Zill-e-Sultan (the shadow of Sultan) instead of Farah Izadi (Divine charisma). The floating signifiers of Iranian reason were articulated around the central signifier of class justice with the warranty of Zill-e-Sultan (the shadow of Sultan). In fact, Ferdowsi codified the Persian political reason collected by the court Magi in Sassanian era in a written form and rightly called "the letter of the Kings" or the same "Khodayname" which, in fact, he founded the political philosophy and philosophy of the Iranian history renovating the philosophical bases of the political wisdom of Iran by Avicenna with the help of the wisdom of Ashrafi and the episteme of Hermes. The 'non' of the Iranian wisdom was described through the language of religion and in the framework of concepts such as "Jinn", "Satan", "Zandigh and heathen" whose sin was nothing more than saying "yes" to life while the legitimacy of the Muslim rulers was nothing more than the negation of life. Therefore, "the non" of the Iranian reason in the Middle Ages were, movements like Khoramdinan that the majority of them were formed in the land of the Jibal (mountains) and among the Kurds, and Hama akhori says, it did not circulate among the Iranians, Arabs and Turks.

For this reason, Kurds, who were introduced as Zahak, and serpents in the ancient period, became notorious as Devil "Al-Akrado Min a Jinni", Satan and Zandigh in the middle ages as far as a saying from the Prophet that it is the will of God that the Kurds never be able to achieve the political independence. The Kurds had their terrestrial legitimacy and anti-aristocratic political system in the ancient period with an earthly/Promethean culture in the Median government. Further, they questioned the hierarchical system and the Iranian/Arab class structure under the framework of movements like Khoramdinan, and they challenged all metaphysical sanctities and heavenly legitimacy and the constraints resulting from the civilization. In the same way they called Zahhak's father as Mardas, they named Babak's father

as Mardas. It was through the unity of the intellect of Iran, Arab and Turks that the Khoramdinan uprising was suppressed by cooperation of the Iranian Afshin and Taherian family. The unity would be established between Arabian and Iranian political reason and later Turkish political reason under the title of the political wisdom of Islam whose power would be warranted with the sword of the Turks, they get its legitimacy from the Caliphas and Arabic religion, and they provide its knowledge from the Iranians with the pens of those like Ghazali and Nizamo-almolk. The reproduction of the unity of the intellect of Iran, Arab and Turk is quite evident against “the other”, i.e. the Kurd in the contemporary period.

it is clear that we cannot focus on the middle and contemporary period according to the same pattern we wrote about the ancient course. After the Mazdakids, and in particular, after the Khoramdinans, the Kurdish identity, or Mithra, that is, contract / Pardis was concealed, and Iranian / theosophical society Mithra replaced it. Along with the predominance of Iranian Mithra instead of former Kurdish Mithra, the culture of sub-mission in mysticism replaced the tragic culture of Mithra and resulted in the silence and submission period of the Kurds.

Mithra/contract was completely forgotten because of the lack of the Mithra's political action, and Mithra/Pardis was not forgotten, but changed its asylum. In the absence of Mithra/ contract, i.e., the lack of Median/Kurdish political sovereignty, on the one hand, and the dominance of metaphysical culture, on the other hand, there was no possibility of action and speech about Mithra/Pardis. For this reason, Mitra / Pardis retreated into the field of Kurdish folklore and poetry; though, there remains the sediments of the concepts of Mithra (Contract / Pardis). Moreover, the Kurdish contemporary politics, in line with the emergence of modern nationalism, is void of Mithraism meanings which were found in Mede, Gaumates and Mazdakids. However, the contradiction of Iranian wisdom against Kurdish identity has still remained. The modern state in Iran developed as a single - ethnic state based on the denial and suppression of non-Persian ethnic nations, especially the Kurds, but the Kurds' culture is no longer the Mithraism culture although there are signs and traces of Mithra/contract which is too far away from the original Mithra.

The development of apparent modern -state was formed in Reza Shah era based on the same features, but it was the ideology of state nationalism that represented the political Iranian wisdom instead of myth and religion in the justification of the social order, monarchy and the class hierarchy of Iran and the formation of both the royal governments of the father and son was based on the suppression of the national uprising of Kurds, Semko and Ghazi Mohammad, respectively. It does not mean that the Kurds, or the fight against the Kurds was the main factor for the formation of the modern state in Iran; certainly, a set of national and international factors has been involved in the formation of the Iranian state. Nonetheless, one of the main factors in the formation and subsequent development of the Pahlavids system was the question of the Kurds and their suppression. As the Farawartish uprising was not the only uprising against Darius, but it was their most important one according to the inscription of Darius himself in Bisotun. In Pahlavi era, the Kurd ' revolt was not the only uprising and there were other uprisings including Sheikh Khazal, Colonel Pesian and .. . As a matter of fact, however, the main factor in the development of Pahlavi system was the uprising of the Kurds since the

modern government in Iran was developed against and due to the suppression of the ethnic / tribal movements. The modern government was a one ethnic Persian government to maintain its sovereignty over other tribes. Reza Khan –as Katem says- called his main mission as the suppression of Semko, and after the suppression of Semko and the occupation of Mahabad, there were celebrations all over Iran. During this period, which Iranian reason was trying to modernise Iranian society by rejecting Islam and religion as superstition and tradition, the only thing that was taken from modernity was the centralized government. Modern concepts were “articulated” based on the notion of Iranian wisdom. That is why the centralized government became the symbol of reason, progress and modernity, and the ethnic groups without the government became the symbols of tradition, superstition, backwardness and ignorance; thus, the “non” of the modern Iranian apparently wisdom became decentralizing and anti-civilization Kurds who became known under the name of the aboriginals –like the mountainous Turks in Turkey- who have not yet entered civilization, and it is the duty of modern Iranian wisdom to bring them into the process of civilization whether violently or non-violently. The aboriginals were “the non” of the modern state of Reza Shah, which was the symbol of civilization and reason and progress. The aboriginals meant those who have not entered the process of civilization and the progress of history. Therefore, “the non” of the civilizations, progress, wisdom and history are the natives who have remained in pre-historic era far from the process of the progress in history and civilization, just like the Westerners who gave the title of aboriginals to American natives on their arrival in the continents of America and Australia.

However, with the development of the Islamic Republic, Iran returned to Islamic values, it had the ideology of political Islam in the contemporary era, it rejected the western / ancient values, and it expressed its political power through the language of religion and God instead of wisdom from the language of religion and god. Furthermore, the unity, the clerics’ oligarchy sovereignty, celestial legitimacy and metaphysical culture, and Hermetic/religious knowledge were not formed except through suppressing and negating the “non” or the Kurd which conveyed values like democracy, federalism, secularism, secular and communism justice and terrestrial culture. At the beginning of the victory of the Islamic revolution, it was only the Kurds who did not accept the ideology of the revolution and stood against it, and the Islamic Republic did not develop except with the suppression of Kurdistan and the denial of its values. As Ayatollah –Allah Talaghani said: “If the Kurdish question is not resolved peacefully, the Islamic Republic will lead to dictatorship as previous regimes”. The ideological cloud of Iranian wisdom cast its shadow all over the Iranian sovereignty other than Kurdistan, but the social worllife and its manifestations in secular and non - religious parties was hindering the development of Iranian wisdom. Therefore, the problem was not dissolved; the gun barrel replaced the ink of the pen, and the ink of the pen only covered the blood of the gun. Again, the politics of antologic aspect found primacy over thinking. The Kurdish rebellion failed politically once more. As always, what prevented the success of Kurdish movements was military repression and then the Iranian cultural bombardment of the Kurds. In fact, the Iranians have always suppressed the Kurds since the time of the Medes era up to the present time, and the dawn or the sunrise of Iran-ism was equal to the sunset of Kurds. Thus, “our problem is not justice in future is not justice in the future, but it is the revenge of the past”. \*\*\*

The subject of this book is history, however, the book is not a historical book, but it is a survey of the political affair in history. The political affair focuses on us and the other. The other or the enemy, for the legitimacy of the friend and ourselves, is the foundation of the political agenda. According to Carl Schmidt, if there is the final distinction between good and evil in the field of ethics, between the ugly and pretty in aesthetics, between profit and loss in economics, there will be the distinction between friends and foes, or between us and the in politics. The Iranian/ Persian political issue is based on us, the Persia and the other, the Kurd which has become the foundation of us and the other in other areas of religion, myth and art. We, the good, Ahura, the angel and the Zoroastrian light have been formulated in contrast to the other of evil, Ahri-man, demon and the darkness in address to Kurdish Mithra which is accordance to us and the other of Persian politics because the concepts of evil and Ahriman have been used in the metaphysical religion of Zoroastrianism in address to political other of Persia, that is, the Mede and the Median religion, i.e. Mithra. The we of the Iranian mythology like

Feri-don, Jamshid, Kaykhosraw, ... have been processed in contrast to the other of Zahak, Afrasiab and ... who are Kurds. The we of the Persian totems and symbols like the cow and the eagle have been processed in against the other of the lion and the snakes, which are the symbols of the Kurds. The concept of Iran itself and "the we" of Iran is in contrast to the processed Aniran which is addressed to the Medes. "The we" of Iranian justice (class) has been defined against the other of justice (equality) of the Kurd. "The we" of Truth and pure religion of the Persia have been defined against the other of lying and bad religion in address to the Kurds. The foundation of us and the other and the dual contrasts of Iranian wisdom in mythology, religion and symbols are the religion and symbols of the us and other of the Persia which is the Kurd. The positivity of Iranian / Zoroastrian signs was due to the political domination of Pars and the negativity of the signifiers of the Mede was because of the dominated becoming of the Med because the predominant ethnicity has defined the signifiers and their contents. The victory of the positively-defined signifiers of Ahura and the light is the reflection of the political victory of Pars on the Mede. It should be noted that the political opposition of Pars with Mede which has been abstracted in the form of religious concepts and symbols has not prevented the cultural confiscation of the ethnicity of the Medes by the nomadic and occupying Pers ethnicity. The invading Persians did not have any social culture and state system while occupying Iran with the military force, as they lacked the land. Because all the political and cultural heritage of Pars resulted from the seizure and occupation of the land, culture and language of the Medes, they must have either destroyed the Medes completely or they should have considered them as belonging to themselves and under their own occupation. This logic led to the dual encounter of Iran with the Kurds during the long-time history, that is, on the one hand, the violence and extermination of the Kurds political and cultural movements, and on the other hand, defining obeying Kurds as themselves and as original, that is, the acceptance of the social existence of the Kurd minus its political existence since the acceptance of the political existence of the Kurd means the negation of the Persians themselves as the existence of the political and cultural identity of Pars is due to the negation of the political being and the confiscation of the Medes culture and land. The secret of all this hatred of the Mede in the Persian religion and mythology is the hatred of the lack of identity and history of the Pars. The Mede must remain as dark and abominable, and it must be pushed

back into the field of non-thoughtful domain because the necessity of the thought moral and political motivation of the Persian is dark and non-thoughtful stay-ing of the Medes who are the main owners of Iranian culture, power and the land. Therefore, on the one hand, they have suppressed the political Kurds with violence and propaganda and they have defined them in the form of hateful concepts like the agents of evil / imperialism, brain-eater/ head-cutter, on the other hand, they put a great emphasis on the original and Iranian being of the Kurds.

Pars is the name given by the Mede meaning the border and the bounda-ry and the Mede means the centre and the median. After the conquest of the Medes land and the confiscation of their culture, Pars has tried to forget his history-less, culture-less and territory-less in the memory of history and to introduce himself as the center and the middle. In one hand, it has discarded the political Mede as demon, lie and Zahak, and on the other hand, it has confiscated and established the cultural and so-cial Mede under its own name as a branch and part of Persian civiliza-tion. Since Fars owes its whole being taken from the land, state and cul-ture to the chirography and language to the Mede or it has confiscated it from the Mede, there is no possibility of interaction and dialogue be-tween two cultures. For this reason, it is not the struggle between civili-zation and culture but it is the struggle of the culture and civilization of the Kurd with a looting and culture-less ethnic group. Therefore, it, taken from FerahIzadi to Wali Faghi, tries to destroy the existence of the Kurd completely in the form of lie and the enemy or it tries to define Kurd in his own words and languages.

Pars political reason is, in one hand, suppressor and, in the other hand, it is producer and confiscator. After fixing its domination and military suppression, the Iranian wisdom has began to schematize the subject of the Kurd and to make its identity; hence, it has internalized its ethnic - class dominance according to the inferences with regard to concepts of the age. In one hand, it has destructed the Mithraism works of the Medes, and it has badged former Median Mithra to the devil, and on the other hand, it has constructed the artificial Mithra as the angel and the creature of Ahurmazd, the Zoroastrian god. On one side, it has sup-pressed the Kurds and occupied their lands and cursed and rejected them with titles such as Zahak, Dave and Demon that Persian mythology carries the memory of “the other” being of the Kurd, on the other hand, it has constructed an image of the Iranian acquiescent Kurd and the in-nocent angel submissive to the Iranian god. Iranian wisdom, on the one hand, is the murder factory , on the other hand, it is the man-making fac-tory. On the other hand, it kills Astiag, Gaumates, and Ghazi Moham-mad, and, on the other hand, it produces Harpag and Iranian original Kurd. The main dominance of the Persian superior etnnicity/class is not in its army and ruling violence, but it is in the dominance of the con-cepts and their definitions. The Iranian / Persian conceptual contrasts such as Iran Vs Aniran, the Iranian unity Vs the separatism , the Ahuraian order Vs the evil assault, good faith Vs the evil and blasphemy, the goodness Vs the evil, and ...are a reflection of the ethnic contrast of Persians with the Kurd in which the dominant Persian wisdom has dis-armed the Kurd with negative concepts against its decoration with posi-tive concepts. The concept conflict, which is a reflection of eth-nic/political opposition of the Pars and the Kurd, has, of course, been defined by the dominant Pars ethnic group being succedent or subse-quent to the Mede. After political and military dominance over the Kurd, the later Pars signifier conquered the land and confiscated the cul-ture of the Mede, and it renamed, redefined and revalued the concepts. The above-mentioned conceptual oppositions, which one end of

which is goodness and the other end of which is evil, both are the construction of party. The later Pars party has described itself as goodness and the other as evil. The classification of the goodness and evil had not been emerged in the meaning horizon of former signifier of the Kurd and these concepts are neither sacred nor metaphysical but they are the construction of the political power. There exists no connection between language and being. The later Pars signifier has constructed the positive signifier of the goodness, Ahura and purity in address to itself through naming the former signifier of the Kurd as evil, Dave and Demon.

Pars cast its sway in the clothing of global concepts according to the requirements of each period. These global concepts taken from the Ahuraian order and the global religion of Zoroaster to Islam, the left and the global citizen which all have been the instruments of globalizing the Pars sovereignty. Persian / Iranian dominance has persisted its hegemony despite frequent political splits. The absence of the Persian central government has led to riots on the Kurdish side; however, these riots have not caused the disruption of the sovereignty of the Persian hegemony and they have not established the Kurdish power. Therefore, we say addressing the Kurds as the irrational rebels, since they think of themselves in the framework of the counter-concepts and they have not been able to create concepts that fit their practical riots. The interlocutors of Iranian/Persian evil counter-concepts were the Kurds taken from the devil and Dave to separatist and head-cutter or severer. As the Persians have conquered in the war of the concepts and they have had the power to define them, the Kurds have always failed in terms of conceptual and they have not upraised to the stage of stabilization. The root of the creation of the Persian concepts /counter-concepts is political / ethnic and, if we ignore its political / ethnic origin, they lack any depth and meaning. Nevertheless, since the relation of these concepts have ruptured with the causation of the violence and politics behind it, or at least the Kurds are not able to understand it as the result of the shortage of the historical memory and the creation of their own concepts, they have assumed these concepts as natural and metaphysical from the Persian viewpoint instead of understanding these concepts in relation to the policy of domination and power relations, and they have become fascinated by the same concepts that they are struggling with in practice rather than the conceptual oppositions against it. Despite the political riot, the Kurd lacks a new order beyond the Iranian order due to the theoretical captivity like Mazdakids and Khoramdinan. In the face of fulfillment, however, it is an Iranian order not a Kurdish order despite Kurdish flesh and blood, like Safavids and Zandis, or because of the lack of relevant concepts suited with the Kurdish order, they remain as tribal order like Ardalan, Baban and today's parties. Therefore, one of the main reasons for the refusal of Kurdish political order in history is its conceptual refusal and captivity in Iranian concepts and meaning nets.

For example, the concepts of Iran, cultural Iran and multinational Iran, which non-Fars ethnic groups define them as an inherent and eternal concept of understanding and beyond Pars, are the hegemonic tool of Persian sovereignty. Cultural Iran beyond the scope of its political boundaries is the tool of Pars political imperialism to reproduce its ancient empires and expand the boundaries of Pars. Persian wisdom explicates the sovereignty of the unity (Pars) over the multiplicity (non-Fars ethnic tribes) in the framework of "unity in multiplicity". It conceptualizes the domination of one clan over the other clans in the framework of tribal

confederation; thus, it justifies its own ethnic nationalism in the framework of civil nationalism. The ruling religions of the Persian government, which has invited non-Pars ethnic groups to imaginary happiness, have been the tools for realizing the true Persian happiness. The Kurds have deposed the legitimacy of their practical riots by thinking in the form Persian counter-concepts like Dave and separatism. For this reason, Kurdish action, being void of the right concepts with their revolt, despite costs and braveries, has led to the reproduction of Iranian / Persian sovereignty and not to the actualization of the Kurdish order, since from one hand, the practical action and public culture of the Kurd have not passed to the political and national identity, and on the other hand, Iranian political identity lacks a cultural basis. The Iranian identity is the construction of the ruling apparatus from Sasanian to Reza Shah, and it has no cultural basis in other non-Fars ethnic groups except in Fars. In other words, the dominance of Pars of Iran on the Kurd/Mede is the dominance of politics and power over the culture.

We pointed out in the introduction that the contrast between Kurd and Iran is not only the contrast between two ethnic groups but also the confrontation of two viewpoints; the contrast of logos with eros, the earth with the sky, human intellect with metaphysical reason, and freedom with religion, too. This contrast has been politically realized in the form of dual confrontation of equality justice against class justice, terrestrial legitimacy against metaphysical legitimacy, Dionysus culture or anti-culture against Apollonian culture, the Prometheus against Hermes in the form of conflict of two Kurd and Pars ethnicities. The symbolic contrast of which is the snake against the eagle, the lion against the bull, the darkness against the light. We have processed these double concepts from the angle of the Kurdish mind - set and subject, while the written dual confrontations that has reached us, have been described as the opposition of goodness against the evil because the one party that has codified it has been the dominant group and has described the other of the Kurd as in the concepts of evil, darkness, hell, liar, Dave, separatist and ... . Because of the lack of the Kurd subject and that the subject of Persian recognition had constructed the dual concepts, he had described his sovereign self as goodness and the defeated Kurd as the evil and badness. Now that the subject of the Kurd is born and capable of developing its historical world, we should study the genealogy of the Kurd beyond the Iranian goodness and evil and evaluate the values again. From one hand, we should replace the value-laden concepts of Persian ethnic group describing themselves as the goodness and the light with the concepts of the political thought such as equality justice, the divine right of kings, the metaphysical culture, etc., in the other side, we abstracted the anti value-laden concepts of evil, lie and demon in describing the Kurd instead of the concepts of the political thought like equality justice, terrestrial/contractive legitimacy, Dionysus culture and ... and showed the historical and religious references of dual concepts in three periods of Cyrus/Feridon versus Astiag/Ajidahak, Darius versus Gautham, Anoshirvan versus Mazdak, and Zoroaster versus Mithra. Thus, as it is evident from its conceptual contrast, the contrast of these two ethnic group is the contrast of two political thought, too. One of the important components and subjects of political thought, is the government, the way of government formation, the relationship between the individual and the totality of the government, the relation of the government and nation/ethnicity, the definition of justice or legitimization of the government or the same authority. Now, if we compare two political



thought of Pars and Kurd, the contrast of two orders is completely different and contradictory, that is, horizontal, contractive and plural order of Kurd versus the vertical, despotic, and monistic order of Pars.

In the "thought of the greater Iran, Shah (king) himself, god on the saddle, was counted not as the unique but as the strongest institution of this system ... besides this institution, other unifying factors like Iranian culture ... were able to guarantee the historical, ritual and intellectual continuity of Iranians in the long centuries. The Iranian culture, of which the thought of the greater Iran was central to it intermingling with Persian poetry and literature in the Islamic era, was assumed as the second pillar for the survival of Greater Iran (Tabatabaee, 1380: 115- 116). Thus, as based on the ideas of the Iranian researchers themselves, the King and then poetry and literature are two columns of the Greater Iran thought. Nonetheless, there exists two pillars of king and literature and folklore in Kurd culture, but there is a subtle difference between two ideas, a difference in the size of the two different history and distinct political order of the two ethnic groups. The king in the Mede is chosen based on the social contract and is the creation of the people who, in case of the deviation from the wishes of the people is withdrawn; the example of selection based on a contract is visible in choosing Diako and an instance of removal, in case of deviation, is obvious in the Manaiads' rebels against their own king, as we indicated before. However, the King is chosen in Pars not according with the consent of the people but he is chosen from the beside of the God having divine legitimacy that the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the people does not affect his determination and dismissal. This is the same conflict of conventional/terrestrial legitimacy with the divine legitimacy of Pars. The logical conclusion of this is the lack of the public acceptance of the Pars king imposing from above with divine legitimacy and emphasizing on unity and vertical or hierarchical order, and the result of king's popular acceptance among the Mede is the emphasis on agreement versus the unity and horizontal order. The unity in the thought of the Greater Iran is possible through the removal of the multiplicity and the sovereignty of the unity on multiplicity; however, the agreement in the Median thought is possible through preserving the multiplicity and it is an plural order. The difference in Kurdish plural order and the order of the Iranian unity order is also quite evident in conceptual evolution. The main subject of Iranian order and the legitimacy-giver to the Persian Shah (king) is the divine charisma meaning the sign or the symbol of God that are reproduced in the modern system of Iran in the form of Velayat - e Faqih, and the Ayatollah, but the origin of this concept is not Persia Kurdish meaning very many kings, i.e. the multiplicity of kings and pluralism. In the separation from the Median order to Persian one with regard to changing the political system, the content of this term was radically changed by maintaining its appearance. Farah, which means many and diversity in Kurdish language, was transformed into Farrah meaning the divine sign. The meaning of Izad, which meant the king in the Mede, was changed to Izad, or the creator God and the meaning of Farrah-e Izadi, that meant very many or multiplicity of the kings, was transformed into the symbol and the chosen of Gods. In Mede, the God or the Creator of heaven and the earth meant nothing and the people were the Creator of the political order. The political order was the product and the creature of the will and the agreement of the people, but in Persia, Izad/King was transformed into Izad/Ahura, and the political order was not changed into the product and the creature but into the creature of the divine will and it was eternal and instinctive in the continuity of the cosmic order; hence, Manuel Cook is rightly presumed the

word Shahanshai (the king of the kings), not as Persian but as Median. The Kurdish order is the agreement in pluralism, the agreement by maintaining the differences. Hegematan, the capital of the Medes, means the place of the agreement, and Hakhamanish means the idea of unification, the unification based on the preservation of pluralities, and an agreement based on the preservation of the differences. We observe the multiplicities and acceptance of the differences today in Kurdistan whether in terms of language, rituals, and even political parties, as its reverse is evident in contemporary Iran.

The other result of the metaphysical legitimacy of the Iranian king is the priority of the totality of the government over the individual and the sacrifice of his person and desires for the sake of the whole government and the imposition of the despotic order, while the result of Shah's terrestrial legitimacy in Mede is the primacy of the person over the totality of the government and the formation of the totality of the government on the basis of every member of the society and the general order along with people's satisfaction. The divine legitimacy of the Shah in Pars leads to the formulation of legal and political rules that are not proportionate to the desire and satisfaction of the people, as the laws must conform to the Sharia and the will of the God, while the logical result of the king's contractual legitimacy in the Mede is the formulation of the political laws in accordance with the wishes and agreement of the people in which there does not exist pre-determined laws and rules beyond the agreement of the peoples. The metaphysical legitimacy of the Pers king conforming to the cosmic order leads the society to become hierarchical and classified, that is, the same order we cited as hierarchical or class justice, while the logical result of the king's earthly legitimacy in Mede leads the social order to become horizontal and plural, which we processed it as equity justice. The reason for this difference goes back to the difference between Zoroastrianism and Mithraism; Zoroaster, the legitimacy-giver of the Iranian political order, on one hand, and Mithra, the developer of the Kurdish order, on the other hand, are the product of the geography and character of the two ethnic groups. The Kurdish political thought originates from the concept of Mede/Mithra (contract/paradise), the Mede is the concept of its political geography and Mithra is its cultural and political/legal content. The Medes have been the aboriginals of the region and the sovereignty of the Medes have been over their own people and land and if they have ruled over other tribes, it has been based on the Mithraism contract pre-serving the plurality and autonomy of the defeated people through treaty and contract not through conquest and suppression.

The kings of the Mede were chosen in accord with agreement and contract among their own people, and they lived with their neighboring ethnic groups via treaty and agreement, the instances of which are Man-naids' treaty with Hittites and Astiag's treaty with Lydia and Babylon. Possessing their own usual geography, the Medes did not need any military campaign to seize the soil of the others, except to defend their soil and prevent the other's assault, such as the defense against Assyria. Nonetheless, the Persians lacked their own land and geography mainly due to being nomads; thus, they attacked the Mede, conquered it and subdued its inhabitants through military force. By the conquest of the land of Mede, they called it their own paradise lost, Iran, and because they were invaders and occupiers, they sought a metaphysical legitimacy

for their ruling in the absence of popular acceptance. To maintain their sovereignty over the people and occupied geography, they had to form political order through the dictatorship governments in which the Persians raised to the top of the pyramid and turned into the superior class through plundering the capitals of the defeated Medes; hence, the defeated Medes were placed at the bottom of the pyramid, and the Persians used the concept of hierarchical justice so as to justify their own superiority. Because of the imposition of political order by conquest and pillage, and non-acceptance instead of the agreement, they requested legitimacy via the union with the divine laws and the unacceptable king invoked the divine right of kings.

Geography has been and will be one of the important factors of conflict; not owning any geography at all, the Persians considered the totality of captured geography as their own, the totality which belongs to the Mede. In the same way, the totality of the Persian culture and language has been the confiscation-contrast of those of the Medes; in any case, the Mede is the fact of the symbolic order of Persia. The problem of the Kurd-Iran is not mere political like the issue of the geography and the Iranian symbolic order is the result of and based on the confiscation-contrast of those of the Medes. The confiscation-contrast has involved the dual behavior of the rejection-internalization of the Medes. The Iranian thought is the draft of the Median culture which has turned as in correspondence to the requirements of the migrant ethnicity.

The origin of law in the thought of the Greater Iran is the will and the divine Sharia; whereas the law in Mithraism is not dependent on the will of God and theology, but on the Loyatani will of the government, nor the unchangeable natural laws. The law in Mithraism is the consensus agreement among the people, it does not have a non-changeable essence and it is not metahuman and not dominant on the human but it is the will and agreement of the man. There is no legal and moral idea beyond the human will, the idea is neither substantive as in Plato, nor does it depend on the will of God as in Akoinas, and not dependent on the will of the mortal god like the government in Hobbs, nor does it depend on the will of the king as in Iran, but it is the collective and mental agreement of human beings which is the creator of every idea whether legal or ethical. There is no supreme authority neither of God, nor the king, nor the nature or the Sharia.

Mithra's legal theory is also the pioneer of the political thought of the government; neither the divine holy meta-human government, nor the giant Loyatani government, nor the violence and dictatorship, nor the political anarchism, but it is the creation and product of the consent of human beings. Politics is in the continuation of neither the ethic, nor the religion, nor the violence, but it is the collective action and general consensus of individuals. As according to Herodotus, the agreement among the tribes in choosing Diako to judge caused the Median government to emerge from non-existence to the political existence and kingdom. In this narrative, people are not the raw material of the government or responsible against it but they are the creator of the government and they have their own right in it. The will and agreement of the people precede the government and predetermine its essence and rules. This political

idea is a reflection of the ritual of Mithra in which the contract preceded every kind of pre-determined rights, laws and principles.

The political thought deals with the idea of "the law" independent of the person and "the public interest" while there existed neither an independent law going beyond the personal vision of the king, nor beyond his personal intentions in Iranian thought; thus, there did not exist any possibility to develop the political thought and we must only speak of the political theology or the king-worshipping myths. However, in the old Kurdish political thought, Mithra is neither the preferred God to the laws, nor the miracle doer prophet that can break the laws; Mithra himself is the law independent of any power and the person. Therefore, since the law of Mithra lacks any pre-determined essence and it is only a general agreement, it is the theory of the law, on the one hand, and there is the public interest in it; hence, there must be the possibility to formulate the political thought in it.

The religion was the source of the law and ethic in Islam and Iran, too. In post nation-state in Greece, the instinctive laws were the source of ethic and religion. The government laws were the authority of religion and morality in nation-state. In Mithra, neither of these three components is substantive; collective concord is the reference of law, religion and morality. The religion is not a metahuman being matter, but it is a way and style of life and the world life principle, this is why there is no pre-determined god, prophet, law and ethic in Mithraism. It is only the general agreement that enters Mithra from the non-existence of abstraction into the existence of society. When the public agreement precedes the morality, law and religion, the rift between the earth and the sky, the spirit and the body, the instinct and the spirituality do not convey any meanings, and the religion is the same world life experience of the human beings. There, the gap and division between good and evil, and God and man have not formed yet. The goodness and evil are the construction of the others of Mithra, that is, Plato, Zoroaster and ... that they described the former signifier of Mithra as evil and they called their later self as the goodness. It is better to reiterate that the binary oppositions and the conceptual gap in Mithra were not formed in the horizon of the language. The birth of religion, philosophy, morality, law, God and the spirit have been the bewilderment and reaction against the crisis that it has been the life style of Median life, i.e. Mithra; therefore, Mithra has existed prior to the law, ethic and the contradiction of the goodness and evil. In the ritual of Mithra, there was the life experience, desire and pleasure. The morality (ethics) is a name that tries to explain the former material of Mithra. Neither the morality, nor the religion, nor the goodness and evil had any significance. There had been only life. Only, the concept of Mitra has been abstracted to mean contract/paradise. The contract has formed legal and political relations and the paradise has molded the social life style and public culture. Now, we will abstract the conceptual Mithra in the absence of the real life Mithra. In fact, the loss of the unity of God / man, which the western philosophers such as Hegel were seeking it, was not in Greece but in the Media where God and man had not yet been separated from each other and the man, instead of obedience to God, was God himself and the God was the creature of man; in the same way, he was not the slave of political order but its creator. If Hegel's missing principle, which is the realization of God and general concepts in the earthly political order, was the same Mithra/contract, the Dionysus dance of Nietzsche would not be in Greece but in Mithra/paradise of the Medes.

The central subject of the Greater Iran thought of God / Ahura is the source of the laws and ethics and the creator of the political order and the legitimacy-giver of the king with divine

Farah. The political order of the Greater Iran is in the continuity of divine cosmic order and the king is the earthly symmetry of Ahura Mazda. But the central subject of the Median thought, though it is the same word of (Khoda) God, has the other meaning in conflict with the perception of the Greater Iran thought. The word 'Khodai' is Median in origin meaning a powerful self; besides, even today the Kurmanji pronunciation of Khoda is Khode which also means self. Iranian culture has taken Khoda (God) into the sky by confiscating the word transforming its meaning into absolute power and a great creator. Whereas Khod (self) was powerful in Mithra, the Khods (selves) were the creator of the political order and ethics, and there did not exist any religion. The agreement among the Khod (self)/Khods (selves) or he individuals was the basis of the ethics and law and the founder of the government, but with the transfer of God to the sky, the period of agreemental ethics and law came to an end and God, or the metaphysical idea, became the source of political and moral laws.

However, after the deterioration of political power of the two ethnic groups, culture or literature and poetry became the only institution for the preservation of thought, but, like the sort of kingdom (Shahi), there is a fundamental difference between Kurdish and Persian literature. Persian poetry and literature, whether in its epic form in Shahnameh or in its mystical form in Molana Rumi, is metaphysical and spiritual. In the epic form, Shahnameh is the narration of the same metaphysical legitimacy in the framework of divine charisma and class justice of the kings such as Jamshid and Feridon; in its mystical form, it is totally humiliating the earth, body and the emphasis on spirit and heaven, which led to development of the concept of Vallaia in the continuation of the grace of prophecy. In fact, what is known as the idea of the Greater Iran has been reproduced in the religion of Shiite in the form of Valayat-e Faghih and in the form of the concept of Vallayat-e Anbia in mysticism. Besides, it has led to the development of the concepts such as the complete Morshed and Vallayat-e faghih with mysticism and Shia unity in the Safavid era and the entrance of the concept of Val-layat from mysticism to Shiite in which the metaphysical legitimacy of ancient kings of Iran was reproduced in the form of Vallayat-e Faghih or divine legitimacy of Faqih. The political thought of the Media /Mithraism, in return from practical politics and internalization in poetry and folklore like the mystical thought that was in the continuity of the Greater Iran thought, was internalized in the continuation of the Mith-ra/Paradise ritual and in contrast between Persian literature and culture. As the result, it puts emphasis on the earth, body and biological freedom in contrast to the Greater Iran thought which puts stress on the spirit or soul, spirituality and metaphysics. The mysticism in Kurdistan, unlike the Iranian mysticism, is neither theoretical and moral, but practical and limited to dance and Sama and joy, which reproduces Kurd-ish/Mithraism "Halperke". The Kurdish culture in general, and its folklore in particular, which is the reproduction of Mithra / paradise, has been split from the Kurdish politics and, that is not the reproduction of Mithra /Paradise but it is in reverse to its.

With regard to the breakdown of the Kurdish politics from its culture, the material of the Kurdish - order is lacking its desirable form and by flying in disproportionate forms with the logic of Kurdish order, we oppose against our own selves and we agree with the others taken

from Lenin to Bookchin and inversed Mithra /contract instead of the contract and an agreement with the selves and against the others. The politics of the Kurd, on the one hand, turned the contract upside down and, on the other hand, Mithra/paradise has retreated into the realm of arts and literature in the split of Kurdish culture, and there has been developed an gap between political partis, as the conveyers of the general concepts with popular folkloric culture as the carriers of the joy and individual-ism. The Kurdish politics is similar to a blind camel in the split from its historical memory and Mithraism thought. The politics in Kurdistan must reconcile, on one hand, with Mitra/contract, and with Mith-ra/paradis, on the other hand. The political thought and the national identity are not somethings that we seek in the Western Isms, but we must rebuild them in accordance with the requirements of today's subject through rethinking of the political history, from one side, and Kurd-ish literature and folklore, from the other side. It is noteworthy that, contrary to the Iranian stubborn and petrified political thought, the Kurdish political thought is in corresponsance to the notion ruling over world whether in its political shape or in its social form. Mithra/contract is not only consistent with the theories of democracy and social contract and individualism in its political form, but also more advanced and more important of all it is in progress invisibly in our political imagination. In its social form, Mithra/paradise, meaning the earthly paradise and biological and sexual freedom, is consistent with the social culture and post-modern thoughts that consider, contrary to Iranian mystic culture, the soul as the cage of the body. For this reason, we have demonstrated the emergence and the decline of metaphysics in theoretical bases in which the deterioration of metaphysics, is the deterioration of the metaphysical thought of Iran, and the emergence of the biological / terrestrial thought with Nietzsche and Foucault is the emergence of political thought of Kurd, too .

Pictures

The birth of Mithra from the heart of a rock having a knife in one hand and a torch in the other.  
The knife is for killing the bull and the torch is anti-solar or sun in the dark caves

The bull-slaying of Mithra in a dark cave The vase or the cup of Mithraism wine in the shape of the lion in which they drank the blood of the bull along with drunkening milk of Haoma and they got drunk and danced after killing the bull..



The Persian kings while killing the lion The battle of the lion and the bull is the symbol of the Persians, Zoro-aster, and the symbol of the sky and winter.

The lion is the symbol of the Medes, and the symbol of the winter and the spring

An image at the entrance of the Lalesh Mehrabe in Iraqi Kurdistan and the snake-embossed inscription on its.



The images of the lilly flower on the gate of Lalesh Mehrabe The symbol of Izadis on the gate of Lalesh

The inscription of Bistoon

The image of ShahMaran (the king of the snakes) who is one of the ancient Kurdish legendary stories, a woman with a human head and a snake body.

The map of the Medes empire, taken from Wikipedia Map of Asia from Ptolemy's cosmographia , Holle, Ulm, 1482. From the Author's Collection: CA 146

### The Endnotes of Chapter one

1.It is a reference to Odysseus myth when Odysseus' and his companions' ship was crossing the island, he made them fill the cotton wax in their ears so as not to hear the Sirens' voices. The Sirens were the legendary creatures, half - human, half - animal who pretended to be beautiful women with amazing voices, try to assure sailors, who pass their island, that they just want to entertain them with beautiful melodies. However, those listening to their songs became like pigs and half animals. The song of the sirens is symbolic of the call of instinct, and putting the wax in the ears is a symbol of the seriousness of reason and morality in restricting the instincts. Iranian / Islamic and Greek reason is a symbol of Odysseus seriousness and ethics which prevented the release of the instincts and the imposition of non - personal integrity of reason and morality on the instinctive life of individuals. But the Kurds, following their natural and instinctive life, were always rioting against the imposers of ethics and reason (wax).

It is a reference to Hiddgar's example about hammer. Heidegger defines the true being or the origin of man as the action and considers thinking as a result of weakness of the action. When a person hits the nail with a hammer, he continues his action unless an obstacle pops up in front of entering the nail; thus, the person does not think about it, but if there is any obstacle in front of the nail, the person will go on thinking and asks about what happened and why the nail did not enter and .... Nietzsche also thinks of the thought as the result of the weakness in action. In the weakness of paws and teeth ,i. e. action, . One takes refuge in the weapon of thought. In the weakness of confronting the tragedy of life, the man takes refuge in the Apollonian illusion of religion and philosophy. He considers the distinctive aspect of man, that is, knowledge and cognition, as the result of social oppression, namely punishing people for violating social norms. Lazariof, in his book "the history of Kurdistan" which mostly focuses on the Kurds history in the Islamic era, considers the Kurds as a rioting and rebellion nation who have not given in to the dominance of any rulers, governments and Khaliphates. In his view, it did not matter for the Kurds whether it was the Sassanian model or the Umayyad or Umayyad Caliphate ... and that the Kurds have not submitted to any authority in the real terms, and no sovereignty, except in the apparent form, has been able to dominate the Kurds in real terms (Lazariof, Sul-tani, 2010).

## The Endnotes of Chapter Two

1. F. König, *Die älteste Geschichte der Meder und Perser*, 1953. s. 69

Prasek, *Geschichte der Meder und Perser*. 1906, s. 48

R. Grishman, 1976, *L'Iran des origines à l'Islam*. translated by Mo-hammad Moin, Tehran, 1388, Page 65. Besides, some writers like Mi-norsky, Richard Frye, Herzfeld, Hertel (Johannes) has defended the Aryan/migrant being of the Medes.

2. Prasek and König regard the formation of the Median government and civilization and the defeat of Assyria as the result of the aristocracy of the Aryan superior race in the region. Prasek says that Indo-Europeans ..., i.e. Iranians initiated the historical life of the region through their migration and he does not consider the natives worthy of an independent life in the region. König also believes that the Medes triumphed in the war with the help of the ethnicities (Indo-Germans) living on the margins of the sea (Prasek and König, the previous). Also, see the book of the kingdom of the Medes by Aliov who has criticised König and Prasek (Aliov, 1388, 38-39).

3. M. Diakonov, *The Kingdom of the Medes*, translated by Karim-e Keshavarz, Tehran, the scientific and cultural publication, ninth edition. Pages 133 onwards.

The confession of Aliov, *The Kingdom of the Medes*, translated by Kambiz Mirbeha, Tehran, Ghaghnoos publication, 1388, pages 83 onwards. Other writers like J. Mars, the founder of the Yafesi school, have defended the aboriginal being of the Medes and they have rejected the migration theory. See Aliov, the same.

4. Diakonov accepts the change of the local language into the Aryan language but he does not regard it as the sign of the change of race and ethnicity. He gives the example of the Egyptians whose language transformed from Barbarism into Ghepti and from Ghepti into Arabic but the Egyptian people are the same old and local people of the region and the change of the language into Arabic does not indicate the racial change into Arabs and absolute dispelling of the natives from Egypt. Besides, to provide more evidence for Diakonov's view, we can give the example of Iran where the people wrote in Arabic but were the Iranian people removed out of Iran? Herzfeld also does not assume the language similarity (proximity) the same as or equal to racial similarity (proximity) and he says those who were living in the plateau of Iran especially in the west of Iran and speaking in Aryan language does not signify that they were migrants, too but they accepted the new language (M.M. Diakonov, 1364, 45-46). One of the reasons for the superiority of the Indo-European language was the assault of Scythians-Cimmerians in the

Mede (Aliyef, 1388, 137). Herodotes has also indicated that the Medes sought help from the translator to learn archery from the Aryan Scythians. Sargon speaks of the powerful and distant Madadi in border of the east oblique (Aliyef, the same, 288). Thus, when the Medes utilized the translator while talking to the Iranian Scythians and when Sargon talks of the medes in the oblique border, they all indicate that Sargon has considered the Medes as distinct from the migrant Aryans in the east and the Medes and the Iranians, in contrary to Herodotes' view, did not understand each others languages. Max mallovan, quoting from Herodutes, knows the Medes and the Pers to be belonging to two different races (Mallovan, 1383, 479).

5. For more information about the weakness and baseless being of the Aryan migration theory in 3000 years , B.D, refer to Frye 1380, page 81 onward.

6. Clement Huart considers the Mannaeans and the Medes to be racial-ly relatives, Iran and Iranian civilization , Clement Huart, translated by Hassan Anosha, Tehran, Amir Kabir publication , vol 3, 1379, page 30. L. G. Morgan also regards the Medes to be the decendents of the Gothians who have lived centuries ago under the names of Kassians and Kosians and... (Tabani, 1380, 94). Analysing this word of Ashur-e Bani Pal "my ungrateful brother of Babylon, Aramians and Ilam turned the Gothian kings against me", Diakonof knows agothians as the address to the Medes (Diakonof, in Ziapour, 384). Clement Huart considers the Manneans as the racial relatives of the medes (Huart, 1379, 30).

Spizar traces back the history of the Medes to 6 thousand years BC in his book called the tribes of Mesopotamia and he considers the Medes to be the decendents of Gothians. Further, refer to Aliov, Mirbaha, 1388 and diakonv, 1388 in this regard). Richard Frye also believes that "the Iranian names were not found in Zagros before 689 BC and there are some notes on Parsova and Mada ... as the residents not the migrant tribes of the region in Shalmansar inscription in 835 BC" (Frye, 1344, 112). Also, Cammron writes,"There are no news of the Indo-European names in Zagros mountains up to the eighth and ninth centuries and the names were Cacasians. The Iranians did not rule over Zagros up to 822 BC" (Cammaron, ..., 107). Girishman considers Madai in Asyrian inscriptions not as ethnic/racial concepts but as the places where the Mede trbes inhabited (Girishman, 1388, 86-88). Besides, Girishman re-gards the Mannnaids as Aryans-Aspians who lived in large parts of to-day's Kurdistan (Girishman, 1388, 94). For more information go to the rest of the material in the main text.

8. The researchers who are in faviour of the Aryan/Iranian being of the Medes like Conig, Parasek, Hertzfield and ... pay more attention to the history of Iran than the nativr history of Zagros and they consider the Medes as an introduction in surveying the history of Iran. As Hints, quoting Borkahart, says the anxiety regarding Cyrus prevents an inde-pendent study of the Medes and we view the Medes as an introduction to come to the anxious history of Cyrus (Hints, 1386, introduction).

9. see the rest to know more about Bokhtan and Boudians.

10. The king of Kalda sees a dream in which mardok assures him that the danger of the Medes will come to an end: Nabonid's sylender in a report on repairing the temples of Haran and



Sipar: When 3 years passed, he –Mardok- made Cyrus, the king of Anshan subjugated and the younger servant stood in a row in front of him (Astiag have been addressed as Omanmanda in paragraph 27) and he- Cyrus- dispersed the enormous number of Omanmand soldiers with his few soldiers and took him to his land as his captive (column 1, paragraph 28-32). The speed of capturing Omanmanda ( in the cylinder, column 1, par 13 the term Goti is used instead of Omanmanda (Cambridge, vol2, 1344, 655). Al-so, Richard frye writes” Perhaps the term Omanmanda have been used to refer to all the nomads and barbars ... and especially for the Medes or probably the Sakais later on in Assyrian and Babylonian sources (Frye, 1344, 112). Moreover, Rajers considers Omanmanda and manda as equal to Madai and Mede (Cammaron, 1387, 173). Omannmand, as based on Wassily Nikitin is the same as Gog and Magog (Nikitin, 1377, 46). For more information, refer to the chapter on Zolqarnain and Gog and Magog ... .

11. Sediq Safizade in the book of the ancient religions of Iran (Safiza-de, 1385, 31). Hashem Razi in the book the ritual of Mehr in ancient Iran (Razi, ...). Aliyef in the book the kingdom of the Mede (Aliyef, 1388, 100-101).

!2. Whenever Mosa Khorni speaks of the Mars, he means the Medes. The Medes were called maars throughout the work of this Armanian historian. He calls Ajidaha (Astig) as the king of the Mars (Mosa Khorni, II, 8) and (Aliyef , the same, 101-102). The Medes have been introduced as snake or serpent- worshipping tribe in the ancient times; therefore, they were badged as Ajidahak and ... in the assault of the Medes. For more information, go to the next chapters ... .

13. Herodotes writes the Mars put on local woven hats (Herodotes, vol3, 94) which maybe the same local hat of the Kurds which it has still been remained.

14. Not the Iranian/solar Mehr. Mehr has had a different meaning from that of the Iranian Mehr. Go to the chapter on Mithra and Zoroaster ... .

15. Islamic historians from Masudi onward consider the Kurds to be the offsprings of the genes. Mohammad Afandi in his book "Taj al Oroos" considers the origin of Kurds as from genes. Based on his idea one-fourth of each Kurd derives from genes since they are lineage of Belgheis – Soleiman's wife – whose mother was from genes. Abo Moayan Nasaghi in "Bahrol Kalam" writes , "Genes attacked and controlled the Harem of the prophet Soleiman. Some of the women there got pregnant as the result of sexual relations with genes and they gave birth to children who are the Kurds. Quoting the Islamic historians, Sharafkhan Bitlisi in Sharaf Name writes: "Demon married mankind and the results were Kurds tribe". Masoodi also in Marwaj o Azahab, volume 3 writes: "When Soleiman lost power, Satan got hands over Soleiman's bond-women in human's appearance. Thus, believers and those who took refuge in God survived but unbelievers and heathens succumbed to Satan and became pregnant from him. Soleiman told those pagan (infidel) bondwomen: take away the Kurds to the mountains and there Kurds came into being as the result of them. Further, Taj Aroos considers Kurds as people who existed on the earth before the creation of Adam.

16. The supporters of the Aryan being school of the Kurds include most of the western historians who considered the kinship and Aryan being of the Mede and Pars. They believed that the Aryans migrated to the regions of Kurdistan and Pars in the first millennium BC.

Minoresky, Hertel, Schipigel, Konic, Peasek and... are the supporters of the Aryan being of the Kurds. Garzoni and Soldini defend the Iranian being of the language of the Kurds. Solakmay, Fanloshan and Shatir regard the Kurds as the migrants from the north of Europe since they found the majority of the Kurds in Komajin- the east of Turkey- as blond. Shotol-za, who studied the Kurds in the east of Kurdistan, considered the Kurds as brunette and brachycephal (flat-headed) and he questions the Fanloshan's view of northern/Germanic being of the Kurds (Amin Zaki, 1377, 10).

17. Most of the Russian researchers like J. Mar, Diakonof, Petrofeský and some western writers like Sikas and Spizar were the supporters of the native or aboriginal being of the Kurds and Medes.

18. Torodanjin in the collection of -oreology- have seen two inscriptions related to two thousand years BC which speaks of a land called Kar-da-ka in the south of Van lake being the habitat of a people called Soo. Sharfname also writes about an old castle called Soo there. Tiglat Pilsar, the ruler of Assyria, has fought with a tribe called Kurti in Azot mountains in 1098 BC (Amin Zaki, 1377, 44). Tiglat Pilsar the first, the king of Assyria refers to the Kurti tribe in the mountain of Azoba in his inscription in 1100-1115 BC. Further, the king of Assyria has referred to the name of the Kurd in Solgi inscription in 2275 BC (Safizade, 1385, 40).

19. Leman Hauwit, Hartman, and Noldka believe that Kurd and Kardo are different ... (Amin Zaki, the previous, 47). Hauwit considers the Xenophon's Kardoxis not related to the Kurds but to Georgian Kartvelians. Noldeka also says "this area (Kurdistan) was inhabited by Kardokhies in 5th century BC and it has no relation to the Kurds since the Kurds came from Iran some centuries later" (Tabani, 1380, 54).

Sais says the Medes are the nomads of the Kurds residing in the east of Assyria and they are Aryan (Sais quoting Amin Zaki, the same, 68). Darmester and Soun regard the Medes as the Kurds and the Kurdish language as the remaining of the Median language (Safizade, 1385, 61). Admonds says the Kurdish language is the remaining of the the old Iranian language and the Median language (Admonds, quoting from Safizade, the same, 61). Beowar Alima also writes: thousands of years before the advent of the Turks into the Minor Asia, some local people from the races of Yafsi, Sami and Aryan formed the inhabitants of Kurdistan and Xenophon's Kardoxis ... are the ancestors of the first ethnic group of the Kurds. Moreover, Istawbon's Kurti- Kurdoen- and Khalidies have had a share in the formation of the racial element of the Kurd which the Kurdish language changed Yafesi into Aryan with the advent of the Medes and Pars. He also considers the Medes to be the most legitimate efficient factor in the formation of the ethnic element of the Kurd (The last colony, the crisis of Kurdistan of Turkey from the beginning up to now, Beowar Alima, Tehran, Pazhohanda publication, 1379: 9). Furthermore, Karnama-e Ardashir-e Babakan have mentioned the Median Kurds (G.B. Akof and ..., 1376, 18). Hassan Pirnia, too, considers today's Kurdish language as being derived from the Median

language (Pirnia, ... , 76). Minorisky regards the people of Kurd as a combination of two Meradowids and Kurtiuids who had a dialect near that of the Mede ... the Kurds have assimilated many of the local – non-Aryan or Yafesi- factors as they have spread towards the east ... . Nikitin accepts the Median being origin of the Kurds of Minoriski, too (Ra'isnia, the same: 297). Malako Shoarai Bahar also knows the Kurdish language to be the remaining of the Median language (Bahar, Sab-kshenasi, vol1, page 5). Most of the Iranian writers like Khonji (The Emergence of Iran. Prior to the Medes ...), Zarinkob (The history of Iran, the struggle with powers, 330), Sha'bani, Khodadadian (the history of Iran, vol1 ...), Mohammad Amini and ... have accepted the Median being origin of the Kurds.

21. Risk considers Khaledi, Kurdi, Alkordi and Kurdia to be the same and Lorch admits this, too (Minorisky in Amin Zaki, the same: 47). M.S. Aivanof, A. Grantefeski, M.A. Dandamaif, and G.A. Koshlenoko believe that “ based on archaeological traces, the plantation of barley and wheat initiated in the mountainous regions of Kurdistan and Lorestan ... for the first time.

Further, they regard the beginning of animal husbandry and texture as in Kurdistan and they emphasize that the Kurds have been known in today's Kurdistan from the ancient time and the Kurties were the same today's Kurts or Kurds”. The history of Iran, ancient Iran, M. S. Aivanoef and ... translated by Siros Izadi, Hossein Tahvili. Donia publication. 1359: pages 23 & 72. Ihsan Noori Pasha, the Kurd historian, knows Kardo, Hori, Sobari and Mitani to be all Goti, too (Pasha, 2003, 19).

22. Sir Sidni Smith presented these materials in an article which he personally sent to Prof. Amin Zaki and this has been published in his historical research book about the Kurd and Kurdistan.

23. The return from Iran. Xenophon, Jeffery Household, translated by Manoochehr-e Amiri, Tehran, Scientific-cultural publication, 1384.

24. Herodotus also speaks of the land of Bokhtan and Yekh... which Noldka and Hartman know there to be the same Bokhtan or Bohtan (the same, 44). Two tribes forming the Mede, in Herodotus' view, are Bosian and Bodian. Besides, Sharfnama names all the Kurds as the descendants of two brothers called Bokht and Bochan which are the reminders of Bodian and Bosian (Mafragh-e Kalani, ..., 338). Minorosky considers bohtan as the perpetual habitat of the Kurds and writes that we should seek the past times of the Kurds among Pakhtoes, Bokhtans and Bait Ghardohian (Minorosky, quoting from Tabani, 1380: 54 & 91).

25. Sir Percy Sykes and Soun have the same idea, too. They know the Kurds to be the descendants of the Gotis and Horis and they trace back the history of the Kurds to thousands of years BC so that the history knows no nation older than them in these regions (Tabani, 1380, 67). Dr. Canto believes that those migrants coming to Kurdistan from 4 thousands BC were Aryaic –Asiatic which were called Goti and Kasi before the migration of the Aryans (Tabani, 1380, 65).

26. Refer to the next chapters ...

27. Dandamaief and Merry Joyce question the Median being aspect of the Gaumates' uprising and they consider Gaumates as the actual Bar-dia, Cyrus' son. There is Dandaief's argument with regard to the great similarity of bardia and Gaumate in Herodutes' history (Dandamaief, 1386, 159 onwards). Merry Boyce, too, regards Daruis as liar and Bar-dia as the actual Bardia and Cyrus' son and Daruis have killed Bardia, not Gaumates (Merry Boyce, ...). Wishoufer and J. Messina regard Da-ruis to be the usurper but they accept the liar being of Bardia (Wishoufer, 1389, 53 onward...), Wishoufer and J. Messina (Messina, 1932, 99) give the religious aspect to Gaumates' uprising but Danda-maief sees it as political/social. However, all four scholars have some-thing in common that Bardia's or gaumates' uprising did not have a Median aspect and it was the transformation inside the structure of Achamanids' empire.
28. The ancient historians like Herodues knows Gaumates' uprising – who he names as Samirdis- to be the uprisings of the median Mages for the revival of the Median empire against the persians' ruling (Herodutes, 1387, 225 onwards). Furthermore, Plato writes that Cambodia gave away the government to the Medes (Plato, XII, III, 12). The contempo-rary researchers like Nieberg, 1847, (oppert,1879,167) (Spie-gel,1873,310) (Dunker,1867,816-817) (158 - 157 (Justi,...,50), (Pra-sek,1906,261) and Sterava regard Gaumates uprising as the uprising of the Median aristocrats against the domination of the Persians (Sterva, 1941, 374-375), A. Odyef, 1953, 542), and (Herzfeld,1938,107). Al-ieyef also assume it to be the uprising of the Mede for the revival of the Mede empire against the sovereignty of the Persian aristocracy (Aliyef, 1388, 422 onwards; Neinberg,1847, 157 – 158; Justi,...,50; Op-pert,1879,167; Spiegel,1873,310; Dunker,1867,816-817). Diakonof, too, indicates that the Iranians tried to convince the Persian masses that Gaumates wanted to take power from Iran and hand it over to the Medes since he himself was a Median; hence, the connotation of this narrative can be deduced from the inscriptions of Daruis the first and the writings of Herodutes. The ruemers that the new king is in fa-voureof the Medes, as according to Katias view, provided popularity for him in the Mede and he was seeking the support from the Medes. Gaumate tried to take refuge in the general freemen and especially the Medes ... but he was neither a democrat nor the supporter of the reviaval of the kingdom (Diakonef, 1388, 387). Dandamaief believes that Diakonof that Diakonef has shown negligence about the ac-ceptance of Median being of Gaumate uprising (Dandamaef ...). Mo-hammad Jawad Mashkof also know the rebellion of Gaumate as the rebellion of the Medes to retrieve his government (Mashkor, 13-16).
29. Daruis refers to this point when nobody did anything fearing that Gaumate kills those that knew Bardia (DB I, 48ft).
30. Merry Boyce is one of the defenders of the real being of Bardia and the liar being of Daruis. He has announced the reason behind the silence of Bardia's sister against Daruis usurpation as her own profitism and the fear from the death. However, if Bardia's sister ha denied the death of her brother and she has introduced him as the Mage, how it would be illogical that some others would have denied the incident of Bardias killing just because of the fear from Gaumate.

31. The other rebels had rioted; thus, there was no need to cancel it and he wanted to warn them in this way. Gaumate was still in the courtyard that his fate came into an end; therefore, there was no need to magnify it and arouse the feelings through its description... describing him as the Mage was to nullify or stultify the uprising ... . Gaumate was recognized officially in the courtyard and by all the nations of the empire; therefore, giving much value to him who had popular legitimacy was dangerous. However, the other riots took place locally and they were suppressed harshly and the inscription was built in the place of victory over the Medes but Gaumate was in the courtyard threatening all the empire. Daruis wanted to inferiorate the mistake of other nations in accepting Gaumates uprising via defaming it; however, Gaumates uprising was different as its description is different in the inscription. As referred before, we only tried to prove the Median being of Gaumate's uprising in this chapter; refer to chapter ....to see the analysis of the uprising and this point that neither the Mages were Median, nor Gaumate a Mage and for the reasons behind Daruis' introducing Gaumate as Mage.
  
32. Dunker, Prasek, and Konig believed that the transition of the capital to the mede was due to this reason that gaumate was not feeling secure in Pars. Even more, Prasek considered the reason as the neglect – hatred- towards Cyrus' capital.
  
33. The only argument that Walter Hintis presents in the truth being of daruis and his writings is that he could not lie obviously in front of all the people and ridicule himself (Hints, daruis and the Iranians, 198). In response, we should say telling a flagrant lie in public maybe difficult in German culture but the legitimacy base of the political culture of Iran has been founded on lying which the current regime in Iran is the best evidence for it in the telecommunication era of the 21st century who introduces millions of his opponents as some few thugs and the national riots of the Kurds as the riots of the terrorists and the agents of the aliens and ... . This is not only the campaign of the political system and the statemen but even the so-called Iranian intellectuals reduce the national riots of the Kurds as limited to the power-seeking of some thugs and the agents of the aliens. Refer to Ethnicity and Ethnicism in Iran from legend to reality (Hamid Ahmadi, 1387, 306 onwards).
  
34. refer to chapter ... for more information with regard to the Mages, the analysis of Gaumate's uprising, non-Median being but the Zoroastrian/Iranian of the Mages and this point that Gaumate's uprising was not the uprising of the Mages and ...
  
35. Straubon, who lived in the first century AC, considered the Mages to be a Persian group. G. Messina also regarded the Mages as a group of clerics who were not from among the Mede tribes but they were mostly Iranian (G. Messina, *der .(Ursprung der Magier*, Ss 15,42).For more information, refer to Dandamaif, the same, 209.
  
36. I think the letter or the sound "zh" is used in about 70 percent of the Kurdish names and ... such as Rozhan, rozhin, Zhouan, Zhiyar, and even in verbs like bizh, hazha and ... Besides, Althigm has considered the Madria of Tabari as Marghab which, as Yarshater says, is hard to accept (Yarshater, Kashif, 214).

37. We formerly provided evidences that the inhabitants of Zagros were Kurds from 3 thousands years BC from Göties era up to the Medes. Therefore, Mazdak is a Kurdish name which its correct form has probably been Mazhdak or Mazhdaq and Mazdak may be its Iranian form.
  38. Shahrestan also quoting Tabari regarded Mazdak as Medrya or Madraya which is in the east coast of Tigris (Shahrestani, 1350, 196). The author of Tabari regarded Mazdak as from Tabriz (Christensen, the same, 108).
  39. Xenophon also called this region the place of Kordokhoes. After Xenophon, the left side of Tigri, Judi and Arat mountains has been less called as Kordokhoes and more as Kordoen. Drayor knows the shift in this name as the result of the difficult pronunciation of the sound “k” in Semetics... This region is called Kardo in Aramic, and Jezira Ibn-e Omar as Gazartai, Kardo and ... Armanians called it as Kardokh and Arabs as Bakarda and Kardai... Yaghot-e Hamawi regards bakarda as a part of Jezira-e Ibn-e Omar...later, Karda became Bohtan and Jezira-e Ibn-e Omar (Amin Zaki, the same, 45). Majorson considers Kordoens as the ancestors of today's Kurds and the descendants of the famous Ma-dai. Further, he considers Nairi land where Sanakhrib (682-705), as based on his inscription, has fought with them in Judi mountains as the area where later became Kordoen (Amin Zaki, the same, 92). Kordoen, in Islamic era, became Jezir-e Ibn-e Omar and Botan (Mahmoud AlKhali, 2011, 33) where, as according to Minoreski, “has always been the cradle of the Kurds” (Minoreski in Tabani, 1380, 54). Isili Nikitin knows the main center of Kurds as Toros in the east coast of the Tigris river (Nikitin, the same, 97). For more information, refer to the previous pages of this same chapter.
  40. The writer of the book – perhaps Farhad-e Ne'mani- writes that the reason for the formation of Mazdak movement in western regions of Iran was more oppression and cruelty there. However, the problem does not lie in more injustice in Kurdish areas as we think the class and oligarchic system of Sassanids has not observed justice causing discontent in other areas, too.
- But why did Mazdak's uprising take the massive form in the western or Kurdish regions? Nowadays, Iranian nationalist writers reduce the Kurdish nationalism movement to economic reasons and deprivation as the result of their biased Persian centerism viewpoint and add that this economic cruelty is not only in relation to the Kurds but for all the ethnicities in the country. We state these issues firstly to indicate that the roots of the Kurdish riots can not be reduced to economic problems and deprivation and secondly, as they themselves say, if there is such an economic oppression and deprivation towards all nations in the country, why do merely the Kurds complain and rebel more today just like in Sassanids era? Khosraw Khosrawi also writes in his book “Mazdak” that Mazdak's uprising occurred in Sawad and Meda'en and it did not spread in other parts of Iran (Khosrawi, 1359, 7).
41. Bal'ami writes: when Ghobad was in jail, there was a secret meeting between him and Mazdak and Mazdak suggested to him that my followers have increased but we do not have corps, I will collect them to take you out and to fight with your corps. Ghobad answered that “your followers are common people and they can not fight with the corp, I need the corp to respond to them” (the translation of Tabari history, Bal'ami, Mashkor, 824 AH, 145-146). As Ibn-e Balkhi said Mazdak escaped to Azarbaijan after Ghobad was captured; hence, the corp of the masses that Mazdak promised to provide for Ghobad were

the people of Azarbaijan, i.e. the Minor Mede. Ra'isnia also, in admitting the concentration of mazdakids in the Minor Mede (Azarbaijan), writes: "One of the strong reason for the presence of Mazdak movement in Azarbaijan is a letter that Khosraw Anoshirvan has written to the Paz-odian of Azarbaijan after the suppression of the movement in which he has promised to the people of this area a just government a respect for the serfs" (Ra'snia, the same, 825).

42. Khosrawi indicates that in the time of the Arab's assault on Iran, Rostam suggested the retreat to Azarbaijan to the king but Yazdgerd goes to Khorasan instead. Why? Because Khorasan was the center of Mazdakian and the king did not have any hope in their support. Mazdakian turned their back on Sassanids in the war with Arabs (Khosrawi, 1359, 46).
43. Refer to Kasrawi, 1377, 64-65; Ibn-e Maskawayh quoting Kasrawi, 102; Zairinkob, 1384, 317 & 333 and Minorosky, 1387, p11 onwards... For more information, refer to the rest of the page...
44. Refer to the rest of the material about Khoramdinan ...
45. Refer to the introduction of this same chapter...
46. Refer to the previous material...
47. Bahram-e Farhoshi also in the article-Ko'lita- knows Azarbaijan and the Lake Ormia to be the center of fire temples and the old Iranian rituals. He has considered the words like Asht, gol, kol, sowich and ... in compound words like goltapa, goldara golmankhana, socha, kolsara, koltapa and ... as the reminiscence of the fire blazing in the fire temple of this area which exist in Kurdistan, too and they have given their names to the villages... they use those ashens to fertilize the lands (Fe-rawashi in Ra'isnia, 93).
48. Those like Ibn-e Moghfa', Maghdasi, Ibn-e faghih, Mostawfi, Noldeka, Bartold, Hertzfield, Girishman, Minoroski, Diakonoff, Pirnia, Kasrawi, Pourdawood, Moein and ... know the name Azarbaijan to be derived from the name of a person called Atropat of Pahlavi or Azarpat of Farsi. The main reasoning of Istrin is that he has lived in the time of Ashkanian and he says that the descendents of Atropat were still ruling this land. Zaryab-e Khoi also write in the great Islamic encyclopedia, "Azerbaijan has been derived from the name of Atropat who was an Iranian warrior who was the commander of the corps of the Medes in the war of Iran and Alexander ...and he was appointed as the ruler of the Medes by Alexander, and after the independence of Atropat this region, which was called Minor Mede before, was named after him..." (Zaryab-e Khoi quoting Gholizadeh, 1387, 32—33). Adwin Rght sees no doubt in the derivation of the name of Azarbaijan from the name Atropat as there is no sign of this name in the traces related to the time prior to Alexander. This name corresponds with the overthrow of Achaemenids government and the beginning of the independent ruling of Atropat (Azarbaijan, Right, 29).
49. Karim-e Keshavarz believe that the Mostajal government of the equalism sector put the name of Azarbaijan on that region. That area has not been called as Azarbaijan in any sources before that time (Keshavarz in the introduction to Diakonoff, 1388, 10)

50. Refer to the rest of the materials.
51. Refer to the chapter on Mehr to find out that the Medes were Mithraists not Zoroastrian and the Median Mehr meant contract and it was different from the Iranianized Mehr meaning sun-worshipping.
52. There are many Islamic centers, Hosanias, Basij canons ad... in Kurdistan region to absorb and assimilate the local culture of the Kurds.
53. Kasrawin, in the book "Azari or the ancient language of Azarbaijan" published in 1304, made a distinction between Azari language and Tur-key and traced its back to the Medes era as a complete Iranian language in spite of the dominant view that considers Azari as from the same root and family as Turkey and as being imposed on those people on fifth century (Rai'snia, the same, 859). Before the publication of Kasarawi's theory, Azari language was known to be the same as Turkey from the part of Azari and western and even Iranian writers. However, after Kasrawi's book was published, it had a great influence on calling Azari as an Iranian language. Moreover, Aliyef, the prominent Azari writer, who was one of the tough advocates of Turk being of Azaries, would find out the root of Azarin language among Iranian languages and he considered it as separate from Turkish language without presenting any linguistic arguments after the publication of Kasrawi's writing.
54. Kasrawi and Yarshater know the root of Azari language to be derived from the Median language and Hosseingholi Katebi regarded the Median language as to the ancient root of Azarbaijan language. Thus, Kasrawi considered Azari language to be developed from the Medes' language and the result of the combination of the language of that ethnic group with the language of the natives prior to Azarbaijan which was different from the Median language; hence, it is a semi- or half-language not a language. This is a Pan-Iranism conclusion of Kasrawi as he himself said "what I wanted was to remove all the various languages which were spoken in Iran taken from Turkey, Arabic, Armani and Assyria to half-languages of Gilaki, Kurdish, Lori, Semnani and ... so that all Iranian have the same language -Farsi-; this was my desire and I have tried in this regard" (Kasrawi, 1304, 541). He has considered the Aryans to be the superior race and he has spoken of them in an admirable tone ... he has known the civilization as the result of the Aryan race (Rai'snia, the same, 860). In this line, he has counted the Kurdish language as a half-language at the level of Gilaki and he has obviously spoken of its deterioration .... This connotes no meaning except providing the so-called academic support for the ethnic suppression and genocide carried out by Reza Khan. Kasarawi does not give any significance to the local people before the Aryans and he considers the language to be the best means to know the race and people (Kasrawi, the same, 321). However, as Rai'snia has indicated if the language was the illustration of everything, we would consider the Egyptian Ghebties as Arabs and native Americans as English people (Rai'snai, the same, 861). Since Yarshater also has known Azarbaijan as the habitat of the Medes, he has considered Azari language as the remaining of the Median language before the advent of the Turks ... as there was no dominant language there in major centers of Azarbaijan before coming of the Turks but Ashkani and Farsi language (Rai'snai, the same, 856). The only argument that Yarshater provides about the root of the Azari-Median language is that there had not existed any language before the advent of the Turks!!! So what about Kurdish language? Thus, as Kurdish language is disregarded, the Kurd nation is also repented and it is based on these views of the so-called



Iranian intellectuals that the Iranian politicians, from Cyrus to RezaKhan, has acquired the legitimacy to suppress and kill the Kurds.

55. Minoresky, J. Mar, Darmester, Nikitin, and ... have proven the Median root being of the Kurds. Refer to the previous materials about the Medes ...

56. The name of the work of Bodagof ... the practical teachings of the Turk-Tatar-Azarbaijani dialect ... Mikhail Lazaroef in his work called the ethnology of Turk literature have known the Turks of sothern Cacausia as the Turks of Azarbaijan. Mirza kazim Baig who – according to Bartold- is one of the Russian pioneers of orientality has divided the Azarbaijani Turkish language into two southern and northern dialects, that is, Iranian and Cacaussian in his book called the comparative grammar of Turkish languages in 1846 AC... . Adolof Berga published the poetries of the Cacaussian Turkish language poets under the title of the poetries of Azarbaijan poets in Laipzik ... Arbedon Baig Kochlari, the author of the wellknown work called the history of the Azarbaijan literature around Turkish poems ..., has given the title of Turkish literature of Azarbaijan to it... (Ra'isnia, the same, 84). As it is evident from the title of their books, the writers make no difference between Azari and Turkish, for instance, they survey the Turkish poems under the title of Azarbaijan poems and ... Moreover, Sam'ani in "Majma-ol Ansab" in 562 AH has called the language of Azarbaijan as Azaria and the authors of the " Nama-e Daneshvaran" who were among the scholars of Naseradin Shah considered Azari language as Turkish describing the life of AboAla Moeri ... and as based on their views the language of Azarbai-jan people has been Turkish in 5th century AH (856-857).

57. The oldest Turkish written works found are Orkhon and Yanisiei related to the 5th up to 10th centuries AC. These inscriptions are wide-spread around the Orkhon river in Mongolia and Yaniseie river in Sibe-ria. Wilhelm Tamson from Denmark succeeded in reading and decodi-fying these writings for the first time in 1839. One year later, Radolf from Germany read the Orkhon inscription and published it... which some of the were Aramic and some were Roonni and ... . Aristof, Maliteski, rashid-e Rahmati, and Ahmad Jafar Oghlo have known the origin of these writings to be old Turk Tamghaes (Ra'snia, the same, 846).

58. And they have a language called Azari that no one else can under-stand 9Mojam-o Albeldan, vol1, p 160).

59. Many have considered the migration of Turks in 5th century AH like Saljukids and ... as the second wave of the Turks migration and they believe in the existence of Turks before the Medes in the region... even in the formation of the Mede union (The history of literary language of Azarbaijan, Hajief, 22). Hajief knows the non-Iranian languages, which Diakonof names to be existing in Mede, to be as Turkish language with-out any reason ... he knows Kasies as Khazars and Turks (Ra'snia, the same, 866). J. Mar has regarded The Median language to be Ilamids ... and Hajieof has known the Ilamid and Turkish language to be derived from the same root; therefore, he has counted Medes as Turk... So-leiman Aliarof criticizing Alief – whom Hajieof followed- wrote: "alt-hough he was the advocate of J Mar's theory in a while, laer on he re-jected it. He considered Ilamid language as the relative of the Mede language for a time and the Mede language to be the origin of of to-day's language of Azarbaijan as a part of Turkish system but he refused this wrong view later on" (Azarbaijan Journal, 1988,, vol7, 174). Maybe Azari language can be considered not as a Turkish language but as an Iranian language under the influence of Kasrawi that can not be true either. Istrawben has refered to the similarity

of the languages of Mede and Pars and also to Sakais ...which Hajieof , based on this similarity, has concluded that the language similarity of Sakai and Mede has been the result of the existence of Turkish speaking tribes among both of them (Ra'snia, the same, 871). Mir Ali Saidof has spoken of the combination of Azarbaijan people that “ (there are) three major branches ... the Mede tribes in the southern Azarbaijan, Albanian Aran in the north, and Turkish speaking tribes in both parts of Azarbaijan, but the majority has been Turkish speaking tribes (Saidof, quoting from Ra'isnia, the same 872). Nonetheless, the theories which trace back Turkish language to Sumeri time and Adam and the theories that consider all civilisations as rooted in Turkish civilization are rather ideologic and propagandistic than scientific; thus, they are too insignificant to be considered and criticized.

60. Diakonof, Alieof , Leorman and Donar deny the existence of any relation between Sumneri and Ural-Altai languages.

61. the Mede of Atropaten, which later was renamed as Azarbaijan, did not include only today's Azarbaijan but Kurdistan and ... Kurds, who have always inhabited this land, are residing in Mahabad, Oshnawia, Sardasht, Piranshahr, half of the Orumia and ... where they are together called western Azerbaijan in Iran. However, there does not exist so much Azari/Turkish people in Kurdistan. If we deduce an eth-nic/linguistic meaning from the word Azarbaijan, which is derived from Atropaten, the Turks must claim Turk/Azari being of those Kurds living in a province so-called Azarbaijan. However, it is a fact that there are more Kurds in so-called western Azarbaijan province nowadays and it provides more evidence for its being Kurd in the history since Kurds, in contrary to Turks/Iranians have had no conquering empire to assume that they have occupied and inhabited it later. However, Turkish empires taken from Saljuqids, Ghezelbasian and Ghajran have always tried to move to Azarbaijan and .... And they have occupied and resided in Kurdistan through force and massacre of the Kurds.

62. As we pointed out before, the words similar to Kurd have been applied repeatedly in address to the inhabitants of the Mede of Atropaten in ancient inscriptions of Mesopotamia and Assyria and by the Aramian and German historians. However, there have been seen no documents showing the usage of the words Turk, Azari or Ural-Altai in address to the residents of the Mede of Atropaten. The arguments of Turk/Azari are based on the weak preassumptions of linguistic correspondences; nevertheless, the linguistic similarity and the language hegemony in a region do not prove the existence of a race related to that language in that region. The Iranians wrote up for 10 centuries in Arabic language and if the only document for recognizing the inhabitants of a region had been the language and the written works, we would have known the geographic domain of Iran to be that of Arabs up to 10th or at least 4th and 5th centuries AH. As Diakonof has said the language change does not mean the change in the residents of that region; otherwise, we must consider the Ghebties in Egypt as Arabs. We can consider the guessed similarities between some languages as true about all languages. Therefore, the writings of some authors like Azarbaijani Aliyef who try to find the roots of Azari language in the old Mede and Ilam utilizing some “few words” (Aliyef, 1388, 140) is baseless. We can discover the sameness of some few words between all languages with a prior purpose in mind.

63. Minorosky in “a new look to the east of Casasia” and his other book “ the Kings of Shervan and the Amirs (rulers) of Darband, Kasrawi in “The unknown Shahriars (sovereigns), Zarinkoob in “the history of Iran from the fall of Sassanids up to Al-e Boya, Ibn-e Maskoya in

“the experiences of the nations” and ... have pointed to the Kurd being of the majority of the inhabitants of that region. Go the rest of the materials....

64. Kasravi, Zarinkoob, Llazariyef and ... Kasravi writes: “the ruling over Azarbaigan and Aran areas was at the hands of the local thugs and the Kaliphates in Baghdad did not have any control over these lands” (Kasravi, 1377, 58). Zarinkoob knows the inhabitants of the Jibal (mountains) and Azarbaijan and Aran as Kurds- the Kurds that are the remainings of Karda, Kardokho and Mada who have been out of the control of the Caliphates, Taherids a Samanids and ... (Zarinkoob, 1384, 333). Lazareyef in the book, “ the history of Kurdistan” sees the hands of the Kurds in all riots of Jibal and Azarbaijan areas and he con-siders them as rebels and outlaws (Lazarief, 2010, 63 onwards).

65. The existence of a special government does not indicate the exist-ence of the people related to them. The Iranians, Arabs, Turks and Mogols have always onslauted and rampaged ouside the domain of their own land and people. The ruling of Iranians, Arabs and Turks over Kurdistan for centuries is not taken as a reason for the existence of their own people and nation in Kurdistan. However, in general kurds have never conquested and ruled over other nations. We can dare say that the existence of a Kurdish Imarat in a region indicates the existence of its Kurds’ inhaabitants.

66. Madlong says the Kurds are Iranian sice his presumption of the ori-ontalits is the Iraniann being of the Kurds.

67. Moregver, W. Madlong writes that “ As Kurdi Daisam came to Tabriz, all the Kurds of Tabriz came to him. After Daisam escaped to Ardabil, all the nobles and the great men of Ardabil supported him” (the history of Iran from the fall of Sassanids up to the coming of Saljughids, edited by Richard Frye, 1379, 201 onwards; Zarinkoob in “the history of Iran from the fall of Sassanids up to Al-e Boya, 1384, 310, and Kasrawi in “The unknown Shahriars (sovereigns) 1377, 60 onwards).

68. the Kasravi ‘s argument that considers two co-named and co-culture tribes in a geographic region as belonging to two distinct tribes is similar to Minoreski’s argument that he, at first, considered the Kurds as Ary-ans and migrants to Zagros in the first millanum AC, then after discov-ering the Asyrian/Babylonian inscription in which the name Kurds was used addressing Zarosids and he said that these two co-named Kurds are from two separate races. Dogmatic and prejudiced presumptions of the theory of Aryan migration prevented Minorosky from admitting the reality of aboriginal being of the Kurds in the region.

68. Many of the Kurdish clans have traced their origion and lineage back to the Arabs to acquire economic/political and even reli-gious/afterhere benefits. Most of the Kurd Iranian families became Shaibani (an Arabic tribe) via faking family trees. Ibn-e Asir, who was a Kurd, counted himself as an Arab after some generations and had a strong Arabism and Son’ism viewpoint (Manzavi, 137, 16).

70. Therefore, since the Kurds themselves have not written their own history and the Arab, Turk and Iraniann historians have attempted to canceal and clean up the history of the Kurd, we must look forward to see the new discoveries regarding the history of the Kurd. Even today’s Turk, Arab and Iranian try to clear up the history of the Kurd and limit it to the history of clans and nomadsin today’s Kurdistan in line with the assimilation and racial

cleansing policies of their politicians. Definitely, when today's national and shovenistic Turk and Iranian governments trace the history of their presence in Kurdistan to thousands of years ago and consider today's Fars and Kurd-inhabited provinces, that were Kurd-inhabited before, as belonging to themselves long during the history, they must fabricate a history for Kurdistan, too. Kurdistan, which was from Aran and Azarbaijan up to Hammadan and Loristan and ... has been circumscribed to today's Sanandaj which is only about one-seventh of the past Kurdistan. When the rulers abstracted Lorestan and Hammadan from Kurdistan, the historians, in contrary to the historical facts, fabricated a non-real and non-Kurd history for it. Even today, the historians are doing the same action about Lorestan and Kerman-shah and trying to separate their history from the other Kurds' and relate it to the history of the Iranians. Thus, Iranians- those like Kasrawi, from one side and Turks, via their assaults to Azarbaijan and the occupation of the Kurdistan- minor Medelands or Azarbaijan on the other side, must omit the history of the Kurds from there and forge an exquisite history for it in line with their policies. Kasrawi proudly says my aim is the removal of Arabic and ... languages and Kurdish and ... half-languages from Iran and the absolute dominance of Persian language; hence, these Persianism presumptions have been effective in composing his history.

71. Madlong also points out Abolhaija the chief of the Kurds and Vahsodans ousted the anarchist or seditious people from the wardship (Madoleng, the same, 207). Kasrawi himself, quoting Ibn-e Asir, points out that Amir Vahsodan and Abolhaija the niece and the leader of the Kurds decided to fight the Ghazans and the people everywhere especially in Kurdistan decided to fight them (Kasrawi, the same, 168).
72. Even Ghatran who was their royal court poet has not regarded Rawadian and Vahsodan as Arabs, How does Kasrawi know their lineage better than Ghatran, Ibn-e Maskoya, Ibn-e Amid and Ibn-e Asir one thousand years later?
73. Ibn-e Asir called him as Gherasonghor but Nezami called him Kurpa Arsalan and Hazhir. Hazhir is a Kurdish name.
74. The ruin of Roindej, the last Kurdish government in the middle era, by Mogols was the repetition of its destruction by Iranian Kaykhosro in the ancient era. Therefore, Meragha has been completely a Kurd-inhabited city until the assaults of Mogols in 618 AC and Roindej, which was destroyed by Kaykhosro, who eliminated Turanian Afrasiab, was not in the east and Turkistan but in the west and Kurdistān. For more information, go to ... the chapter on Iranian myths...
75. from the uprisings of Gaumate, Ferawartish and Chisertokhma up to the riot of Mazdakids, Madich and the revolt of Diarbakir and ... in Sassanids era, Ardashir Papakan mentions the suppression of Madich, the leader of the Median Kurds (Akof, Izadi, 1386, 18). Shahpour he second called himself the king of Iran and Aniran after the suppression of the Kurds (Salam, 2006, 90). Amed - Diarbakir- was massacred as the result of their implacable defence (Zarinkoob, 1368, 452). Ghobad also ordered to kill the people of Amada after conquering it (Kelima, 1359, 174).
76. (Ibn-e Ghatiba, Ibn-e Khakan quoting from Yousefi, 193).

77. “Shah Abbas who was a clever and wise king moved the Kurds to Khorasan as according to Ibn-e Amid’s policy: The Endnotes of Chapter Three

1. Refer to the rest of the materials
2. Refer to Chapter one, the Historical general issues
3. The place of this agreement is Hegmatana which means the place of gathering. Herodute writes that the Medes were scattered in village and they had no central government; thus, the chaos was spread out in that land and Diokes was a prominent man carrying out justice among his fellow countryman bravely and seriously. As the people of the village saw his glory and magnificence, they chose him as the judge to settle out their differences (Herodutes, Mazandarani, 1387, 76-77).
4. Maybe Keshterita, who shows its concern about Asarhaddon in Asyrian resources in 674 BC, is the same Farartes, the successor to Di-okes, so the reign of Diokes has ended simultaneously in 674 BD and his (Ferartes’) 53 ruling which has been local has strated in 728 BC and he has been exiled in 715 BC ... Perhaps, Herodute’s view, who says that residing Diako caused chaos again, is related to this issue of his exile which the Asyrian resources have pointed it out. Later, Asyrians have probabely have permitted him to return on the condition of paying the ransom ... or maybe Asyrians have bluffed about his exile ... what is significant is that Diokes, as according to Asyrians, was the ruler of Mana and, as based on herodut, the rule of Mede, that is, both refer to the same tribe. It is also likely that Diako, who has escaped or exiled, has returned himself since Asyria was busy at other wars with Ilam and ... Babylon nd ....concurrently it did not have the opportunity to sup-press him ....
5. Herodute, on one hand, sates that the duration of the Mede governance was 128 years and, on the other hand, he considers the time period of the reign of the Mede kings as totally 150 years. If 150 years was correct, the beginning time of the formation of the Mede ruling would go back to 700 BC. If we add 28 years of the time of Sakaidis ruling to 128 years, it will be more than 150 years. However, we would get to the time which Herodute regarded as the beginning time of the Medes reign, that is, the period of 150 from 550 which is the time of the fall of the Mede iwhich becomes the year 706 BC which is the time of Diako’s reign. If we do not consider the determined time period for the reign of the Mede kings, i.e. 40 plus 22 and ....and consider as correct his 128 years, then if we add it to 550, it will become 678 BC. Based on the Asyrian sources, Asarhaddon was forced to fight the Medes and Keshterita in 678 BC; after these events, the Asyrian sources mentioned the independent Mede country while they spoke of kinglets and ... before this time. If we relate this to the Asyrian sources which, in contrary to Herodute, consider Diako as a kinglet and exiled, this duration is more correct as the time period of Diako’s reign in Herodute book become about 53 years and adding it 678 becomes 728 BC ... which is not compatible. If we assume that the year 715 in which Asyrians spoke of Diako’s exile, in this case heodute might have made a mistake to speak of Diako as an independent king or the Asyrians might have not wanted to recognize the union of the Mede as an independent country in the

beginning due to their arrogance calling Diako a kinglet or warbler. However, Herodote, too, has said that Diako united the Medes which is true and he has not referred to his authority domain; hence, Herodote and Asyria's view corresponds with this difference that the Asyrian did not admit the independent Mede government ... and they did not have any remedy but recognizing it after years. Therefore, Mannai and Median Diak are the same person indicating the union of these two tribes or maybe these two terms have pointed out the place rather than the names of the ethnic group ... Out of 28 years of Sakaid's ruling, the Medes have been under the sovereignty of Asyria for 6 years of this period, but the king massacred them after that 6 years; thus, 128 years plus 22 years of the period of Sakaid ruling becomes 150 years plus 550 becomes 700 or 706 ... But Diako was captured in 715 and it is possible that he might have been chosen again to the kingdom of the Mede by Asyria after 9 years of imprisonment to preserve the security of the Mede which was important to pay ransom to Asyria or to defend against Oratoids or Iranians assaults to Asyria that parallels to the date 706 BC being king up to 678 BC... However, Herodote considered the year of the falling of the Mede as 558 – the year of throning Cyrus – that plus 150 or 154 becomes 714 which nearly corresponds with the history of Asyrians who say that they have sent Diako to exile. Furthermore, if we add 28 years of Sakaid's ruling to 150 years of Medes ruling, it will be 678 that is the same year when Asarhaddon speaks of the battle with Keshtrita ... Albeit, if the duration of Diako's ruling were 53 years, it would be true again. If we regard Cyrus' war with the Mede and not the final defeat of the Mede which the beginning of the war was the year 553 then plus 156-28 and 128-28 plus 150, it becomes 178 plus 3 ... which means Diako became the king in 731 that minus 53 years of his ruling, it becomes 678 the same year of

Keshtrita's war with Asyria and the death of Diako. Diako became the king in 731 since Cyrus went to the war with the Mede in 553 and as the result Diako is defeated. What people say in public narration that Diako resigned for a while and chaos occurred may be this same his imprisonment and his son probably sat on the throne in 678... If 128 years is true, then if we add it to 550, then it will be 678 of Keshtrita as Asyria says it. Anyhow, it is correct; maybe Diako was not the king or 28 years of Sakaid's ruling is in addition to 128 years which becomes 156, the year of the Mede governance ... 53 years of Diako's ruling, 16 years of his ruling before his imprisonment which he has returned again up to the year 678 when Keshtrita became the ruler of the Mede.

6. Asarhaddon gave his daughter to the king of Sakaid –Partatova- to rebel the threat of Keshtrita. The head of Sakaid called Madvis who was the son of the same king that Asarhaddon gave his daughter to assaulted the land of the Mede as the result of the Asyrians' provocation ... and they left the treasures of Zivia and the gunmetals of Lorstan after themselves ... they plundered and ruined the whole territory of the Mede.
7. Herodote considers the victory of Sakaid over the Hakhshatra –Koaksar. It is likely that Farart's son has been Keshtrita – probably in Farart's time - that caused his death and defeat, then Hakhshatra united the Medes again through the killing of Sakaid ... Perhaps Keshtrita has died in 650 BC and then there are 28 years of Sakaid's ruling. After that, Hakhshatra has become a ruler in 622 and Asyria has ruled in 612, Hakhshatra has died in 585 and Astiag has become the ruler....If Sakaid ruled at the time of Hakhshatra, it would mean that Hakhshatra was the king around 650

and died in 585. Thus, it is possible that the date of his birth has been 675 and he has been 90 years when he has died which. However, it is impossible that he has been the king for 75 years. Therefore, Sakais has ruled for 28 years after Ferwartis' death and it is probable that Sakais has killed Ferawartis. Then, Howkhshatra has become the king via killing Sakais. Herodotus knows the duration of his being the king to be 40 years (Herodotus, the same: 93).

8. he made peace with Lidiadue to the solar eclipse.
9. based on the narratives of the Babylon inscriptions and the texts of Armanian historians Nabonid and the Armani king corroborated with Cyrus in overthrowing Astiag.
10. Refer to the rest of the material.
11. Most of the Iranian researchers like Zarinkob, Ziapour, and Pirnia has defended this theory. According to Pirnia, there was not any main difference linguistically or ... between Persians and the Medes and the change of the monarchy has been an internal issue. The Medes were extinguished soon as if they had the duty to remove Assyria and to provide the condition for the ruling of Persians (Pirnia, 76). Zarinkob also writes: 'the overthrow of the Mede at the hand of Cyrus was not the overthrow of a government but the transfer in a royal dynasty to his nephew, i.e. Cyrus... Their difference was not more than the difference between the Kurd and the Lur nowadays' (Zarinkob, 1368, 107).
12. The writers like PirBeryan, Aliyef, Diakoneof and ... have written about the real plundering and looting of the Medes.

◦6◦

13. Both the ancient and modern writers have not mentioned the name of Persian tribe or Achaemenids in the formation of Persian/Iranian Empire. Katiyas and Nicholas Demessius have spoken of the Cyrus struggle with the Medes in discussing Cyrus 3-year combat with the Medes, that is, the Persian system is so digested in the character of Cyrus that it does not mention the name of Persia. However, they have named the Mede instead of Astiag.
14. PirBeryan has noticed this subject and writes: they have constructed a sacred character from Cyrus as based on the texts of chronological letters and Tora and Greek cylinder who has a liberal personality and he has conquered the lands with the consent of the people. This matter is doubtful as it is consistent with the Persians propaganda about Cyrus (Beryan, 1383, 62-63). Also Sidney Smith writes: the stories around Cyrus' kind behavior with the defeated kings ... is only a propaganda which has just remained in the legends ... (Quoting Malvan, Cambridge, Ghaderi, 1387: 492). Manuel Cook, too, points out that "it was Homeric feeling of honor and glory (they considered war, killing and aristocracy as glorious) which transmitted the Greek feeling specially that of Xerxes to the Persians (Cook, Cambridge, the same, 346). It means that the aristocratic, military and brevity feeling which was in Iliad and Odyssey – such as the attack and the war of Troy – has been encouraged and it has made Greek culture and

specifically Ispahani/aristocratic and Athenian anti-democracy writers like Xenophon to praise and extol Cyrus.

15. Go to the rest of the material ...
16. Tabatabai has acquired the corruption of Safavids and the glory of the ancient time from the westerners: "the European itinerant writers study the ruling system of the ancient Iran from the viewpoint of the Greek philosophers and historians, on the one hand ... which was legal government to fulfil the needs of the people" Besides, he relies on the treatise of Cyrus education by Xenophon in which "Cyrus' mother has considered the ruler of the Medes as despotic but (she says) the justice and law have ruled over in Persia (117), then Tabatabai speaks of the human right and mankind law in ancient Iran (469). Quoting Xenophon, Plato and Herodotus, Tabatabai regards the royal government of the ancient Iran as lawful and based on the interests of the people and quoting the modern western Iranologists, he regards the government of Safavids period as despotic (177). "Modern western itinerant writers consider the ruling system as despotic and corrupted" (the same). Borrowing the western resources, he considers the ancient Iran as under the influence of the Greek ancient historians like Herodotus and Xenophon and as the place of the development, law and human rights, on one hand, and he describes the Safavids as despotic and corrupted under the influence of logwriters like Sharden and Kerosinesky. "His studies –as said on another occasion- with regard to Iranian thought are in the domain of western studies" (Tabatabai, 1384: 39). Let us see whether the differences between these two views of the old itinerant and contemporary logwriters are rooted in the realities of Iran and the change from being lawful to being unlawful or Iran and its ruling system have not changed at all but the narrators and the targets of their descriptions have changed. We hypothesize that the ancient historians like Herodotus and Xenophon, whom the contemporary writers have acquired their descriptions about Achaemenids from them, have not been acquainted with ruling system in Iran and the sources of their history had been the oral information of the Persians themselves as based on the love and hatred views of the Persian victors. However, the contemporary logwriters like Sharden and Kerosinesky, who have introduced Safavids, in contrary to Achaemenids, as the symbol of corruption, despotism, and unlawfulness, have vitiated the ruling system and have been personally present in Iran describing their own observations. We try to provide more evidences for this point in the following:

Herodotus and Xenophon recorded their histories several years after the foundation of the Achaemenid empire by Cyrus and Darius. The other philosophers like the old Plato and the new Voltaire acquired their information about Iran from them. However, what were the resources that Herodotus and Xenophon utilized? Where has the story of Cyrus' lawfulness and human rights originated from? To get a comprehensive answer to this question, go to whole this section in the main body of the book ...



This story is rooted in Iranian Shah worshipping myths (the greater Iran thought) which the father of the historians, Herodote gave it a scientific/historic aspect. "The resource of Herodote information around the history of Iran and Mede is the Iranians themselves, like the offsprings of the seven noble families who were the allies of Daruis and anti-Gaumate or the philoIranians like the descendents of Harpag (Alieyef, 1388, 29; Cook, Cambridge, 1387, 230-240; Rainhart, 240). Herodote himself affirmed taking the information from the Iranians: "In this issue (Cyrus story), I will follow those Iranian writers whose views are not the analysis of Cyrus' conquests but they have expressed the absolute truth" (Herodote, 1387: 76). "Poor father of the historians, he thought he has expressed the view which has absolute truth among all view-points while he has not stated the historical truths, he has quoted the legend of Turanians transforming it into history" (Hertsfield, Bitá, 46; Safa, 1384, 39). Unaware that story he has considered as approximating wisdom is the remaining of Iranian myth which he has heard from the Iranians (Safa, the same, 40). "the myth is also the ideology (meaning in the service of power) of pre-industrial societies or the ideology is the myth of industrial societies" (Igilton, 1381: 287). Many of the delusions spreading out with regard to lawfulness and the heyday of the ancient Iran are taken from Herodote and they have considered the correspondence of Herodote's texts with the king's inscriptions as the indication of the correctness of Herodote's text. "The general convergence of herodote ('s text) and Daruis ('inscription in Bisetoon) is not reliable as the text of bisetoon was spread out in all states, Did Herodote refer to them? (Beryan, 1380, 153). Daruis using the major languages of the empire had started an extensive campaign and he translated the inscription into other languages and he spread it out in Greece among Greek people (Dandamaief, 1386: 183). Herodotes, too, has used the translation of the inscriptions in Greece. Even Ralinsen says: some of the points of Herodote, that are word for word or literal translation of the inscription- from one mother and father- has stated Samirdis as Mage under the influence of the inscription (the same: 186). To get a comprehensive answer to the question posed in this endnote, go to whole this section in the main body of the book ...

17. Kaldanian king see a dream in which Mardook assures him that the thread of the Medes would be removed: Mardook set up Cyrus, the king of Anshan, Cyrus defeated the huge army of Omanmanda (Gog and Mago-Qaderi) with his few army and he overcame Ishtigo, the Mede king and took him to his own land as a prisoner. The Nabonid cylinder reporting on the reparation of Haran and Sipar (says): when the third year came, he - Mardook - made Cyrus, the Anshan king as devoted (king), the younger servant stood in a row in front of him (Astiag have been addressed as Omanmanda in line 37) and he -Cyrus- scattered the numerous soldiers of Omanmand with his few soldiers and took him as the prisoner to his own land (column1, lines28-32) ... the speed with which Omanmanda is captured is constructed by Cyrus (in cylinder , column 1, line 13 the term Goti has been used instead of Omanmanda) (Gerishwhich, Qaderi, 655).
18. Refer to the previous materials...
19. The Medes are notorious as Omanmanda and Tokhmaitiamat in Akad naratives...
20. Khorni describes the Medes as snakes and Ajidahak (dragon).

21. The meeting between Cyrus and Zoroaster has probably been in 555 BC (Hints, the same, 93).
22. The narrative of Astiagos and Darius: a singer named as Angaras praised Cyrus in the court of Astiagos...this fawner singer makes his court the first center of flattery and tympany and causes the decadence in ruling system of Iranians (Zarinkoob, the same: 105). A cleric quoting Atna – in a festival in the presence of Astiagos- pointed to the future attack of Cyrus to the king of Medes in the form of a hog while singing common songs ... (Vidngern, the same, 169). Today's hog-killing of Yarsanids is a symbol of Cyrus-killing and defending Astiagos/Zohak and particularly the temple of Yarsanids in Pave is called Sultan Zohak. Yarsanids' roosterkilling is also a Mithraism and an anti-Zoroaster ceremony, that is, they are Kurdish/Mithraism symbols involving Cyrus/hog killing ceremonies; nonetheless, they speak of the Cyrus glory apparently.
23. Go to the rest of the materials ...
24. Polyanoos says many of the Persians joined the Medes. However, as joining of the Medes to the Persians does not indicate the legitimacy and popularity of the Persians in Medes, joining Persians to the Medes does not signify the legitimacy of the Medes in Persia. As Herodotus said the Persians hated the Medes as vice versa. These are the nobles of the Medes joining the Persians or vice versa and the only thing which is important for the nobles is being always the winner and preserving the concessions. These were the same Median/Persian nobles that joined Alexander, Mongols and Arabs.
25. Diakonof, Pirbayan Hints and Yung write: Cyrus was not merely anti- Median royal court or he did not want to obtain some noble concessions but he wanted to overthrow a dynasty that did not have the Iranian freelancing soul (Yung, 1385, 30).
26. Girishman, Hints, Anyull and ... have accepted the theory of Persians migration from Zagros to Anshan and then Persia but Diakonof has rejected it (Yama Oji, Yazeshk, 1390, 66).
27. Go to the rest of the materials ...
28. There are linguistic similarities between old Persian and Soghdian languages (Boyce, 1383, 18).
29. Go to the rest of the materials in the section on the myths ...
30. Darius and the other six conspiring nobles negotiated on who will be the king after killing Darius and they came to this result that any body's horse will in the dawn, he will be the king. This shows that Darius did not have any legitimacy or superiority over the other six nobles for becoming the king.
31. This is also a legendary narrative rooted in Iranian myth which Herodotus has considered as history. According to this legend: Astiagos had a girl called Mandana and Astiagos sees a dream about Mandana. The magi interpreted the dream in this way that the son of Mandana will take over the whole Asia. Thus, Astiagos did not give his daughter to one of the high-ranking Medes fearing from the actualization of the dream. He gave her to

one of the Iranians who was from an actually good family but being more inferior ethically than the middle Mede men, i.e.

Cambodia who Cyrus was the result of this marriage ... (Herodote, the same, 83). The hybridity of Cyrus has been reflected in response to the Dolfi shrine which address him as a moal; in fact, it was Cyrus who was a moal as his parents were not from one nationality, his mother was a noble but his father was from a lower class since his mother was Astiag's daughter the king of the Mede (Yamaoji, the same, 76). As we told before, this is similar to the prototype pattern made from all the prominent characters of the history from Sargon, Mosa, up to Cyrus and Jumong. These stories have no historical bases and they were made here in the case of Cyrus to hide his real descent having no royal legitimacy and as Katias said he was a shepherd but they made a king root for him growing up in a shepherd family. Xenophon, too, wrote that Howakhshatra -Astiag- gave his daughter to Cyrus and offered the Mede as the of his daughter that its baselessness does not need to be proven.

32. Bersius also says that Astiag gave his daughter to Bakhtanasr, so the marriage between Cambodia and Astiag's daughter is doubtful (Beryan, the same: 38). Bersuis writes that Bakhtanasr has made the seven and hanging gardens of Babylon for the Median prince.

33. Refer to the previous material: the chapter on historical generality.

34. Khonji, too, writes in the pre-Mede history that in the inscription of the Sumerrian king (has come) Goties.

35. We will come to the discussion of the Median government in the following.

36. The prophet of Islam promised the places of Iran and Byzantine to the believers several times or repeatedly. Cyrus also besieged the Persians for the war in the thirst of the Mede wealth and for looting it. Go to the rest of the materials ...

37. Go to the rest of the materials on discussing the Achaemenid government of Cyrus and aristocracy.

38. Herodote quotes that Harpag intended to take revenge of Astiag and since he could not take his revenge alone and without the foreign support, he tried to attract Cyrus' attention through offering souvenirs to the nobles. Thus, he stimulated all the great men of the Mede who were discontent with monarchy and violence of Astiag to appoint Cyrus as their king and to oust Astiag out of the royal throne. After Harpag afforded the pre-ground of the revolt, he sewed a letter inside the belly of a rabbit and sent it to Iran by one of his confidant in the guise of a hunter... (Herodote, the same, 96-98).

39. Aliyef considers the penetration of class culture from developed countries into the Mede as the cause of final collapse of the Mede (Aliyef, Mirbaha, 1388, 405). Wishofer, who has a social analysis of Gaumate uprising and considers it as the introduction of Mazdak's communist uprising, knows the same factors causing the collapse of the Mede as the factoring leading to the collapse of Gaumate (Wishofer, 1389, ).

40. Girishman says that the Iranians ethical and political weakness deteriorated until it renewed in the era of Samanids as the result of the advent of Islam democracy (Girishman, Moein, 1388, 430). Christensen also considers the situation of the common people government set up via Islam as the cause of Iran deterioration in which

aristocratic classes dipped into the masses of the people and vanished and the classes of the aristocrats and clerics were the bases of the Iranian civilization for centuries ... which later turned into the foundation of the Abbassids government (368). It all connotes that the bases of Iranism are nobles and clerics that felt the danger of the common uprisings of Mazdak and Gaumata in the ancient time and Khoramdinan in Islamic era more than others and this same alliance of nobles and clerics caused the deposition of Ghobad and suppression of Mazdakids. Further, it was the conspiracy of the aristocrats that led to the downfall of Gaumata. When a masses and non-aristocratic government was established in Iran at the first two centuries in the beginning of Islam, deterioration penetrated among Iranian aristocrats and clerics up to the time of Abbassids and this Iranian culture was renovated under their support. In contrary to Iranians', Kurds culture has always been based on the communal communism and against nobles and clerics. Therefore, the struggle between Iranism and Kurdism is not only ethnic/national but also social struggle.

41. We will focus on the Iranian aristocratic structure and the Kurds communal structure in the following more. However, it is better to point out here that aristocracy was the base of Achaemenids government and Cyrus ruling which caused the removal of Gaumata, the governance of Darius, the ouster of Ghobad, and the suppression of Mazdakids. But the aristocracy in Media was not able to do anything without the outsider help of Cyrus. This indicates the subsidiary aspect of aristocracy among the Medes but its deep roots among the Persians.
42. Refer to (Girishman, Mo'din, 1388: 89), (Kamran, Anosha, 1387, 162 onwards), (Hints, 1386; 56 onwards), and (Dandamayef, 1386, 134-135) to know about the theories which have presented the theory of the Persian migration from Caucasia route.
43. Go to (Diakonoff, 1388, 155 onwards), and (Hertsfield, Hekmat, 55 onwards) to know about the views which have rejected the theory of the Persians existence in the Media land and consider the Median Parsuash as a non-Persian tribe. Besides, refer to (Frye, Rajabnia, 1344, 114), (Vidter, quoting from Ziapour, 257), (Cook, 1383, 22), and (Kipert and Tomash quoting from Cook, the same).
44. From among the concessions belonging to the tribal aristocrats in the time of Cyrus are: the king can only marry from among the girls in the seven-group tribal aristocrats, the representatives of these tribes can attend the court of the king without obstacle, they can have the position of inherited rulers in their own states, and they have the right to put on the special hats. The king must consider the advices of these aristocrats and ... . The observance of these concessions has been approved in the time of Cyrus: Cyrus married Kasdana, Farnasib's daughter, Cambodius married Faidima, Atanar's daughter who was a Median ruling in Babylon. The attendance of the aristocrats to the court of king was common up to the time of the removal of Bardiast that was evident from the address of Cyrus to Hamakaren while plotting against Bardiast: "Who can prevent us from entering Samerdis-Gaumata- palace? Cyrus consulted the aristocrats in important matters like the war in front of Masagetses (Dandamayef, the same, 225).

45. Cyrus the letter have also pointed it out that Cambodia, Cyrus' fa-ther says to Iranians that to provide the banquacy of both sides, Cyrus must defend the Iranians and the Iranians must defend Cyrus which its condition – as according to Xenphon- was even present in his time (Xenphon, Karimi, 27).
46. Pirnia says Kaykhosro united the heros in the Kavoos court agaist Turanians. Cyrus meant that he united the great men and aristocrats against the Mede (Pirnia, 1383, 62 & 141). We will come to the corre-sponding aspect of Turanians and the Medes. Here, it all means the alliance of Cyrus with aristocrats which have even been reflected off in the Iranian myths.
47. Herodute writes:One of the inhabitants of the Mede called Diokes who was a very wise man thought to access the kingdom power, so he planned to fulfill his ambition ... so that he shows himself off as an honest and truthful man ... (Herodute, Mazandarani, 1387, 76-77). However, this word is baseless since his whole justice for many years can not be taken as ambition and planning similar to the story of Cy-rus' two-day planning- one day exploiting the Persians to work for him and the next day holding a party for them. No one can perform a good role with a bad motivation for many years. Diako must have carried out justice for a long time so as to be wel-known everywhere. Whatev-er motivation he has had, he has done a great job in such a way tha he has been known to be just and legitimate to be chosen as king by the common masses in contrary to Cyrus and Daruis that considered a di-vinely and racial right to be the king. The offsprings of Harpag has re-lated this wel-known and good action of Diako to his ambition just to devalue it, but they have not succeeded in such a way.
48. The temporary abdication of Diokes from carrying out the justice, which Herodute relates it to the personal motivation, might be due to his capture and exil to Homs in Syria by the Asyrians. The re-selection of Diokes as the performer of the justice and the construction of the palace and ... , which Herodute oint it out, is, in fact, his escape or the ending of his being in exil and his return to power.
49. This word of Herodute that Diokes still continues his just judge-ments is the negation of his former words of bulding seven-colored palace and .... Which king residing in a sevenscoured and holy-like palace gives any significance to judgement among the people.
50. Refer to No. 16 in the previous materials.
51. Manuael Cook writes that Cyrus would appoint his own rulers in theconquered regions. Therefor, he has not been the king of the kings or the actual king.... like the kings of the Mede (Cook, 1383, 88).
52. Who was the leader of this triad uprising? Prasek considers Mami Tiarsho as the leader and as the same Diok since the texts have only called him as the Median but Madai has not refered to the Mede tribes but to an special area ... Further, Klawober says as the word “ya” has come in the names of Asyrian enemies, he must not have been Keshtritizis ... Diakonov considered the same Keshtriti as th leader (Diakonov, quoting from Ziapour, the same: 364). The council and contract, and not yper-class and FeraIzad (divine charisma) has had such an importance in the Mede that the historians have not been able to recognize the real leader. Does this confussion come up with regard to absolute leadership of Cyrus? No, because the

leader was appointed based on divine charisma and superhuman factors and not on contract in this case.

53. Islam was the beginning of a plan to loot up the treasures of Caesar and Kasra. For more information, go the section on the design of the government theory in chapter seven.
54. Cyrus' promises was about getting the treasures of Ikbatan and giving them to Persians and aristocrats. He himself says in his cylinder in Babylon that I forced Goths and Mandas and ... to bring me taxation and to kiss my feet. Darius also speaks of the subordination of several nation under the "Persian spears" and taking of the Persian spears to the far-away lands.
55. We mean the fate in Hegel' theory as based on John Hipolit interpretation. Abraham is separated from everywhere and the other nations traveling along with his own tribe lonely. This way of the pioneer of the Jewish religion became the destination and fate of the Jews. The bases of the Iranian empire was founded on acquiring looties and conquests and this became the established fact of the Iranians from Cyrus, Darius, Xashayar up to Xosrao, Yazdgerd and Islamic republic- the way to Qods goes through Karbala. The bases of the Median government was formed on terrestrial/contractual legitimacy and justice-seeking without metaphysical legitimacy becoming the fate of the Kurds from Diako, Mazdak and Khoramdinids up to the contemporary parties of the east of Kurdistan, KRG and Rojava revolution in which no leader has pointed to the divine right, aggression and ... out.
56. Darius writes in Biston inscription: Darius the king says These are the countries which came to me by the favour of Ahuramazda, I was the king of them, Persia, Elam, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, those which are beside the sea, Sardis, Ionia, Media, Armania, Cappadocia, Parthia, Drangiana, Aria, Chorasmia, Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandara, Scythia, Sattagydia, Arachosia, Maka, in all, 23 provinces. Darius the king says: These are the countries which came to me; by favor of Auramazda, they were my subjects; they paid tribute to me; what was said to them by me either by night or by day, that was done (Biston inscription, quoting from Amozgar, 218). Cyrus says in cylinder: ...Guti land (Kurdistan in Iran) bowed down before him,, all the Medes (ummanmanda) and ... all the people of of Babylon, Sumar and Akkad and... bowed down before him (Cyrus) and kissed his feet (The cylinder, quoting from Amozgar, 211).
57. This shepherd/flock (lord/serf) and the claim of the sovereignty of the Persian ethnicity over other ethnic groups is still continuing with two Monarchy and Islamic Republic systems. Today's ruler in Islamic Republic is the representative of Imam-e Zaman – or God – on the earth and all the actions and laws must obtain legitimacy from him. He, like a kind father, has been sent as the result of God's favor to lead Iranians/Islamists and all must obey his supreme and divine rank. His opponents are the enemies and the diverted agents of Imperialism – the enemies were Dave and Demon and the opponents were the agents of Demon and Satan but today the enemies are more touchable and foreign countries and the opponents are the agents of the foreigners. There are no limit to their claims of power since they have dominated the lands of the Kurds, Turks and ...inside the so-called Iranian borders and they are attempting to bring other countries like Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yaman, Saudi Arabia under their control either. Therefore, the Iranian political wisdom is still reproducing itself without any limits and Fara

Izdadi (devine glory) is turned into Vallayat-e faghi , the brain-eater Zahak into the head-cutter Kurd and ...

58. Refer to chapter 6.

59. Refer to the previous materials.

60. Nikolai the Damascus, Pilyanos and Katyas say Cyrus built Pasar-gad in the same place as the memorandum of his victory over the Mede king (Qouting from Shahbazi, the same: 126).

61. Most of the Iranian writers (Zarinkoob, 1368: 86-87), (Shahbazi, 1350) and ...

62. See the book "the inscriptions of the ancient Iran" by Mohammad Taghi-e Rashed-e Mohasel, the office for cultural studies, 1380: 3-32; for more information about the influence of Asyrians on the Achama-nids, see J. Hartmatta *Acta Iranica* I.1974. 29ff. It might be said that the Achamanids foreign policy has been based on tolerance and leniency; nonetheless, it should be stated in response that, first of all, the Asyrians have also had the leniency and there are no document indicating the imposition of their religion and god over the other dominated nations (Razi ...) and secondly, the Persians were more backwarded and philistine than the defeated nations like the Medes, Babylonians and ... as they were living a tribal life having nothing to offer to the others.

63. It should be noted that the devotion to Marduk is far more beyond political cleverance. The gods had the ideological and political aspect and no king had devotion to the allian god opposed to his god. The Iranian rulers revered the Egyptian (and Babylonian) god. In reverse, when they occupied Greece, they set all their gods on fire. There are no documents showing that the Iranians have utilized the names of Zeos, Hera and Apolon (Shandor, Ghazi, 1384: 210). Furthermore, Daruis, who respected the gods of the other nations- Babylon and Egypt- , combated Mithra strongly and destroyed all the Mithraism temples (Hints, 1386: 371). We do not deny the tolerance of Achamanids with the others but we can not reduce the whole issue to this point as we must ask why they differentiated in their treatments dealing with the Greeks and the Medes so harshly? Because the Egyptian, Babylo-nian and Asyrian political wisdom and its metaphysical legitimacy was not in contrast with the Iranian political wisdom but they were all in opposition to the Median contractual and Greek wisdom in which their antiking worshipping political wisdom questioned the Iranian political wisdom.

64. Fry also emphasizes the Achamanids being under the influence of Ilam: Achamanids acquired the marriage between brother and sister from Ilamids and the influence of Ilamids on Iranians was great (Fry, 1344: 99).

65. Unfortunately, that section of Herodute's book which poses on the Mithraism being of the Medes have been deleted by the Iranian traitor translater in the same way that he has omitted the last will of Camby-ses signaling the hatred towards the Medes. He has, in fact, been a traitor since he has not been faithful in transferring the contents or the concepts of Herodute's book.

67. Bogoskoy or Komajin is in the eastern part of Turkey where it is a Kurd-inhabited place even today. Fon Loshan who presented the base-less German-being origin of the Kurds had

carried out the field study and direct observation there. This area is the same place that has been called as Kordoan by Istawbon.

68. Matsan – in Armani- was a kinglet ruling region whose king was captured by Tigran, the king of Armania and he was exiled to the Mar area. Whenever Khorni speaks of the Mars, he means the Medes ...the Mars inside the union of the Mede governments were living in the region assaulted by Tigran ... the Mars were Median from the eyes of the surrounding people... . The Armanian sources did not recognize the Mars-Hories from the Mar-Mede. Khorni says: Ajdahak, the king of the Mar is now called Moratsan, their king was named Maratsas-ter meaning the king of the Mars. These Mars –hories- migrated to Armania land from the areas around Urmia. Mar, Mede, the king of the Mars (serpents), Mehr, Mithra and Mede are the same. Minoreski quoting Khorni considers the reason for the presence of the Kurds in

Armania as the remaining traces of the Mars ... Then, they moved the Mars to three small cities Kharam-Khormdinan (Qaderi)- Jokho and Khoshak-nik ... from Ajdanakan up to the fortress of Nakhjavan ... Khorni, somewhere else, speaks of vishpozong meaning the offsprings of the ajdah (dragon) using the word Ajdaha meaning the serpent and dragon whose antecedents were Ajdaha or Mara who lived freely in Masis. Later these Mars played a great role in the history of Armania. It also indicates that Khorni knows the Kurds in Armania to be the offsprings of the Mars from the Median generation who were moved there by Tigran and being scattered from Ararat to Nakhjavan including Khorams who were the same Khorem i.e. the habitat of Khoramdinan.

69. E. Forr knew Hori and Mitani to be the same but E.F. Idels opposed this sameness. Also E. Mir knew these two to be the same. Her-ozni, too, considered Hori as the half-independent part of Mitani.
70. The difference between Zoroaster and Mithra resided in the difference between the predetermined principles and contract and agreement ... one was based on the duties of individuals and the other on the will and consent of the people.
71. Lentis, too, criticizing Theme's theory, says the existence of social contract has been impossible in the ancient east not even existing in Greece and Rome. He was right in case we recognize the far east as Iran, Mesopotamia and Egypt. Those like Lentis have counted the Kurds as a branch of Iran molding on the Kurds whatsoever they have inferred about Iran and it is no surprise that they were amazed by the analyses of Theme and Meia. The foundation of Mithra is social contract and if Lentis and Shmidet had a short glance at Heodutes' book which has expressed the view of the general selection of Diako and also at the view of diako with regard to the elected kings of Goties, they would find the objective reference of Mithra/contract. Moreover, Lentis accepts the translation of Mithra as contract with regard to bigamy and wife and husband but he regards the relation between father and son, master and pupil as out of mind. In response, we must say that contract is much more needed in these cases. As no right like the rights of the children would be overrun in patriarchy families. This concept is so advanced that that the modern researchers in the western democratic countries have not been able to digest it. Schemidt, who accepts the translation of Mia's contract but in Iranian-Indian culture, is unable to find the objective reference of this concept and he rightly says that the Iranian/ Indian societies have retreated



from their previous conditions. There must have existed the objective reference of these concepts among the Medes, Goties, and Mannaiids and there emerged the retreat with the domination of political Iran and the lord/serf and hierarchical system replaced the contractual relation forcefully. Lents and Schmidt, who could not find an objective reference for the social contract in ancient Iran, put aside finding the real meaning of contract and they render it as the obedience of the inferior towards the lord. They have such a right since there is no room for contract and consent in the caste/class system of Iran and India and they all are formed based on the coercion and hierarchy.

72. The social contract for the formation of the government and its reference in the Mede and Goti
73. Refer to the discussion with relation to mazdikids and Khoramdi-nan.
74. Lents believes that this last segment is an added zoroasterian stanza or segment and it has no relation with Mithraism. Since he considers the bases of the relations between the religion and its followers as the unconditional obedience of the religious orders, he interprets Mithra as the piety and obedience of the inferiors and the followers towards the owners of the religion and rulers. Unaware that if Mithra was obedience and piety, we must put aside –as Theme says– the translation of Mithra as contract. Gershwich knows this segment to be related to the contract between the religion and the followers. Even more, Theme has been deceived by this later added segment and regard its significance as the result of violation punishment from the religion the sin of which is ten thousand times more. Theme neutralizes his own translation of Mithra into the artificial social contract by this last analysis. The principle of Mithra is artificial contract based on the consent and agreement among the people and there are no predetermined right or principle like the religious requirements. If there was a holy domain called Mazdayasna religion whose sin was ten thousand times more, it would mean that there were principles and hierarchical system which the relations are formed based on them. However, the principle of the contract of Mithra was questioning those predetermined principles in which the relations were formed based on the consent of the sides and not on the goodness or badness of the actions.
75. For more information refer to (Pourdavood, Ibrahim, the oldest celestial book in ancient Iran: Avesta, Tehran, Donya-e Ketab, 1383: 56). Pourdavood has rejected the instinctive interpretations of the Zoroasterian class concepts in this book and he recognizes the religious society of Zoroaster as a class society pointed out in the Gots.
76. George De Majil considers the class structure of the Aryan Indo-European societies as manifested in the structure of their religious/mythical awareness which was divided into three cleric, military and agriculture class whether in the religious or social form of the society. (...) Shoal Shaked writes that the concept of the social classes has a hierarchical structure from the viewpoint of the religious knowledge. The survivor is the obedient to the Izadi/religious orders and the guilty is the one who disobeys the religious orders. In Zoroasterian religious knowledge, people are also divided into three groups of Gahanik, Hadeg and Dadig similar to the social classes (clerics, military, and farming groups and the King on the top) ... in Mazdayasna religion, people are divided into three classes. Gots (hats) is more the heavenly knowledge and acts. Dad is the knowledge of the universe and the actions of the universe. Hadeg Manseric is in between those two others (Shaked,

Saghebfar, 1381, 20-25). The purpose of stating these materials is that Zoroastrianism is a religion in the real sense of the word involving a series of sanctities and forbidden acts which their preserving and doing has priority over the consent and will of the individuals. Being far from or near or the more or less observance of these religious principles lead to the hierarchical structure among the religious people being based on more or less loyalty towards the religious sanctities. Therefore, there is no room for the consent of the individuals or the contract and equality among them. What is important is the observance and the performance of the religious principles. Even the agreement among all members of the society cannot de-sanctify or de-necessitate the religious orders like praying as the religion has ascended from beside the God or Ahoramad, the panosophy and it must certainly be practiced. Zoroaster sacrifices the consent and he wishes of the individuals for the sake of the generalities of the good actions and thoughts. For more information, go to the next discussions about Zoroaster.

77. Christensen knows the the Iran community to be a class one based on the blood and ownership or possession (Christensen, 1378: 228). Besides, Refer to (Bengeston, 1937, 115) .(Altheim, 1947, 172) (Galling, 1937, 16) with regard to the existence of feudalism in Iran. The class society is developed based on the obedience and the loyalty of the inferiors to the the superior classe and not based on equality and agreement. Also refer to the previous discussions about the political/social structure of the Achamanids.
78. Refer to the previous discussions about the political/social structure of and the government among the Medes to know more about the objective manifestation and the social/political reference of the the concept of contract/Mithra among the Kurds (the med and Gotis). To compare these with the Persians, go to this same discussions among the Iranians.
79. Go to the rest of the materials to find more information about the way of sun-becoming of Mithra and the other making of the ritual of the Median Mithra...
80. Go to the rest of the materials to know more about the Zoroastrian enmity with the Medes and also about this issue that Zoroastrianism was developed based on the negation and the other-making of the Median Mithra...
81. The Mehrabe of Dowich Altinberg near Viana: a lion that has placed the head of a cow among its feet ... In this same temple of Karnontom, they have made some lions which the water founts or flows out of their mouths and they may be the stone lions related to a natural spring. In the Romanian temple, there is seen the picture of the lion alongside the site of cowsacrificing beside the snake and scorpion (Varmazon, Naderzada, 1345: 95). To find more information about the Median Mehrabas being busy killing the bull and the snake, scorpion and the lion are the animals alongside with Mithra, go to ( Varmazon, Naderzada, 1345: 95) and (Razi, 1385).
82. In the continuation, we will provide more evidence and arguments that the bases of Zoroastrianism have been formed on the negation of the Kurdish Mithraism religion and the Ahriman (Demon) the bull-killer is the same Mithra.
83. Go to the discussions about the ancient traces in which the bull have been picturized as a sacred animal and as the historical symbol of Iran, Assyria and ...

84. Refer to the chapter on the Iranian myths ... the sanctification of the bull in them.
85. Presupposing the Iranian/solar being of Mithra, Varmazon considers Mithra as a celestial /Zoroastrian creature in which the bull is sacred, too. He regards the aim of Mithra in slaying the bull as sacrificing for its regeneration or rebirth and for the sake of the recreation of the cosmic order. But he has made a paradox. He knows the bull sacrificing as divine/cosmic action being defined in the religious framework of Zoroaster, from one side, and he considers the animals alongside of Mithra such as snake and scorpion as Ahriman or Demon-like animals which are the symbols of dirt in Avesta, on the other side. Varmazon finds shelter in his own mental analysis instead of putting aside his wrong presuppositions and solving its contradiction and as Razi says he brings no evidence or document in defence of it. He defines the action of Mithra in killing the cow as a divine/Zoroastrian action to recreate the cosmic order and the presence of the snake and scorpion as the assault of Ahriman to make problems in the action of Mithra (Varmazon, the same: 99) unaware that the Ahriman or the Demon of Zoroaster religion is Mithra itself. James Russell, too, has noted such a paradox: "Always this fault is found that in the cow-sacrificing ceremony, there are various annoying animals attacking the cow which is something we rarely expect to see in the time of cosmic purification and renewal ... the consecutive eternal being of the universe initiates with killing the cow by Ahriman in which the reproduction is spread out" (Russell, Dehbashi, the same, 769-771). How do the Demonlike animals are present in a cosmic/divine ceremony?
86. Go to the chapter on the generalities of the history
87. Go to the continuation about the advent of Zoroaster.
88. Therefore, Newroz is the feast of the Kurds but not in its today's meaning since its original name was the feast of Mehragan whose philosophy was the assault to celestial products and the celebration of Zahak's victory over Feridon and not vice-versa ...
89. Hashem Razi has noticed this paradox but as he himself confesses: "If we consider Mithra as the sun, we will encounter a contradiction since the time when Mithra –the sun –overcame the cow- winter- and kills it existed in Mehragan which was the beginning of winter ... we do not know whether there has occurred a confusion in the concepts of this feast or not" (Razi, 1381, 216). However, I know that Mithra has been not in winter and fall but it has been in the spring and it signifies the lion killing the cow which is the sign of winter connotating the end of winter and the start of spring.
90. It is similar to Farabi which has mistakenly considered the book "The ethology" of Plotin, a neoPlatonian, as belonging to Aristotle finding a solution to the contrast between Aristotle and Plato. He has framed his own constructed Platonic view of Aristotle on him claiming a solution to the contrast of Plato and Aristotle. Forbakh writes: "Hegel claims the suspension of contrast between thought and being but this suspension has only happened inside an element."

i. e. inside his own thought. Hegel has found a compromise between the thought and the thoughtful image of the being and not with the real being. The contrast between Iran and Kurd has also been solved inside the Iranian element and the real contrast between Iranism and Kurdism is unsolved as the real Kurdism has been removed in the viewpoint of Iranian mind and wisdom setting aside the attempt to solve this contrast. The contrast of Iran with the Kurd has been solved with the image of Iran from the Kurd. The Iranian has made an imaginary depiction in accordance with Iranian Plato and thought with regard to a Kurd Aristotle from the real being of the Kurd; thus, they claim they have found the solution to that contrast. The Iranian Kurd is not a real Kurd but a mere predicate for the Iranian wisdom. The image which the Iranians have constructed from the Kurd is nothing more than a watchdog defending the borders of Iran. The being of the Kurd has been consigned to the guard dog of the borders of Iran. This policy of the Iranian wisdom has continued from the ancient time with Zoroaster and Achamenids up to the present era. This has been true not only with regard to the Achamenids treatment of the Medes but also with regard to the treatment of Zoroaster and Zoroastrians with Mithra.

91. Similar to the celebration of Newroz the symbols and the rituals of which is originally Mithraism but the Iranian content and meaning has been given to it. Newroz was the feast of the victory over the sun and the fire but it has been turned into the feast of the fire. This festival, which was held celebrated the victory of Zahak (Astiag) over Kave (Gav meaning cow), has changed into the festival of Kave's victory over Zahak. Instead of praising Zahak, Feridon is praised. Besides, the secret behind the spread of Irfan in Kurdistan maybe this same issue.

Today, Mithraism symbols like dance and Sema'e remains symbolically and unconsciously among the Kurds in the form of Halperke and the Sema'e of Darvishes. Further, Cow killing in Mithraism is still observed among Yazidi, Yari and Hawrami Kurds. However, the mentality behind all of them is different. Both two symbolic forms of Mithraism are contract-paradise and Halperke or Kurdish dance. In fact, Halperke is the image of Kurdish social and political life; its apparent shape is the same as Mithras-paradise denoting happiness while its other form equals to Mithras contract denoting the selection of their kings hand in hand through changing Sarchopi or the first person in the line who conducts the rhythm of Halperke. Halperke is the complete body which is a Mithraism concept. The complete body or the selves (khods) is nothing but the agreement or symmetry of all bodies. Transience (annihilation) concept in the survival (perpetuity) of mystics (theosophists) equals to digestion of individual in the generality of the whole body e.g. Halperke; however, mystics changed the meaning of transience through the projection of God to the sky and replaced a complete spiritual human with complete body. Nonetheless, we should refine the principal meanings for the original Kurdish/Mithraism actions as there it is necessary to find a theoretical foundation for the practical struggles of the Kurds in order to compromise the theory and practice of the Kurds anew.

92. As the Zoroasterized Mithra is not the real Mithra but Vahomna with the appearance of Mithra, the Iranianized Kurd is not the real Kurd but the constructed one under the guise of Kurd. The bases of Zoroastrianism philosophy came into being in against Mithra; thus, it destroyed Mithra. Even though Zoroaster was a Kurd rising in Media with Kurdish language and concepts, he changed the whole previous connotation of Mithraism concepts and developed a new religion in direct contrast to the rituals of Median e.g. Mithraism. In this way, Mithraism

and Medians were described as Demon, dragon and bluffs legitimizing dominance and violence of Persian- Aryains migrants- against Medians –Zagros aboriginals-. In fact 'the other' of Zoroastrian-ism was also 'the other' of Persians. We can describe the relation of PersianZoroastrianism with that of Kurds (Medians)- Mithraism as suppression and confiscation. In one hand, they suppressed Mithraism and destroyed Mithraea, and in the other hand, they confiscated all the Mithraism concepts and gave them new connotations since they were migrants owning no developed culture. For instance, they labeled the real Mithraism as Demon and constructed an Iranian Mithraism mean-ing sun worshipping and the angel of Ahoramazda in direct contradic-tion with the original one. In fact, Mithraism was badged as Zoroastri-anism. In this way, they eradicated the Kurds out of the pages of the history as the other of the Iranian political wisdom so that they can not stand up again on their own feet. They have constructed a fake con-cept of the Kurd under the name of the original Iranian Kurds and they claim the brotherhood and peace between Kurd and Fars.

The endnotes of chapter Four:

1. Go to chapter three, the section on the Medes and Persians
2. Go to Chapter one, the historical generalities with regard to the Me-dian being of Gaumate.
3. Refer to the continuation of the materials in the main text with re-gard to why Daruis introduced Gaumate as a Mage ...
4. To get more information on the various views about Gaumate, go to Dandaif, 1386: 159 onwards, Wishofer, 1389: 43 onwards, Diakonof, 1388, 392 onwards, Alief, 1388:428 onwards.
5. This same killing of Bardia by Cambyses and Mage via forcing him drink the blood of the bull clearly indicates the Median being of Bar-dia and bilateral hatred of both Persian Cambyses and Zoroastrian Mage. Besides, Faridon tried to suffocate Zahak by making him drink the blood of the bull. Certainly, Cambyses has been aware of the Me-dian being of Bardia and his plans that has suffocated him by means of the blood of the bull.
6. If this latter words can not be proven, their values won't be de-creased. What is important is that Gaumate himself and his uprising was the Median revolt against the Persians. To discover the historical details of how it happened is the work of historins; we only try to ana-lyse his uprising philosophically and politically and we are not after discovering its historical details here.
7. Dandamaif and Merry Boyce has questioned the Median being as-pect of Gaumate's uprising and they have considered Gaumate as the real Cyrus' son. There is Dandamaif's argumentation considering the similarities of Bardia and Gaumate in Herodute's history (Dandamaif, 1386: 159 onwards). Merry Boyce has also regarded Daruis as the liar and Bardia as the actual Cyrus' son and that Daruis has killed not Gaumate but Bardia (Merry Boyce ...). Vishofer and J. Messina have assumed Darius as the userper but they have also accepted the liar be-ing of Bardia (Vishofer, 1389, 53 onwards ...). Furthermore, Vishofer and J. Messina (Messina, 1932, 99) have attributed a religious aspect to Gaumate's uprising but Dandamaif has surveyed it more from the po-litical/social persepective. However, all four scholars have something in common that Bardia's or Gaumate's uprising has not had

a Median aspect but it has been a transformation inside the structure of Achama-nids empire.

8. The ancient historians: Herodute introduces Gaumate's uprising – he names Gaumate as Samirdis- as the uprising of the Median Mages to revive the Mede empire and against the sovereignty of the Persians (Herodute, Mazandarani, 1387: 227 onwards). Plato writes that Cam-byses lost the government to the Medes (Plato, XII, III, 12). The con-temporary researchers: (Neiberg, 1847: 157-158), (Oppert, 1879, 167) (Spiegel, 1873, 310) (Dunker, 1867, 816-817) (158 - 1847 (Justi, ..., 50) consider Gaumate's uprising as the uprising of the Median aristocrats against the domination of the Persians (Isteroa, 1941: 374-375). A. Odiaef, 1953, 542 and Herzfeld, 1938, 107 know it to be the Med up-rising for the revival of the Mede empire against the sovereignty of the Persian aristocrats (Aliyef, 1388, 422 onwards). Diiakonof, too, points out that the Iranians tried to convince the Persian masses that Gaumate wanted to obtain the power from Iran and since he himself was Medi-an, he wanted to consign it to the Medes. The connotation of this nar-rative can also be deduced from inscriptions of Daruis the first and Herodute's writings. The ruemers that the new king is after supporting the Medes, as based on Katsias, has made him him popular in Mede as he sought support in the Mede. Gamate attempted to rely on the free-mans in general and the Medes in particular ... but he was not neither Democrat nor the supporter of reviving the Med empire (Diakonef, 1388, 387). Dandamaif believes that Diakonef has derected about ac-cepting the Median being of gaumate's uprising (Dandamaif ...). Maskor also knows the Gaumate's uprising as the Medes uprising to retrieve their own government (Mashkor, 13 ...16).
9. Go to Wishofer, 1389: 88.
10. Refer to Chapter three, the seccion on the Medes and Persians about the domination of the Persians on the Medes, not heir common sover-eignty.
11. Shahbazi considers the inscriptions on Takht-e Jamshid and Naghsh-e Rostam where the representatives of thirty two nations are enthroning the king and raising him on their hands as a clear illustration of confirming the role of subordinate nations in the affairs of the kingdom (Shahbazi, 1350: 98).
12. Although Aliyef and Vishofer have correctly pointed out the revo-lutionary and communistic aspect of gaumate uprising, they have not been able to analyese it religiously and they regard Gaumate as Zoroas-trian and a Mage which we will show the falsehood of these assump-tions in what follows in the main text.
13. This narrative that one of the Cyrus' sons was from a Median mother and he was Astiag's daughter has been reflected in the myth too. Faridon married one of Zahak's daughters in the fiftieth year of his monarchy and he had two sons from this wife named Salm and Tur and his other wife called Irandokht who a Persian gave birth to Iraj (Rezaii, 1384: 38). Tur is the same as the Mede.
14. Refer to chapter three regarding the myths, the section on Jam-shid.
15. Refer to chapter 3 with regard to easternizing the myths.

The endnotes of chapter Five:

1. Refer to the main text in chapter five for more information about Vandid. Vandid is related to the Iranian religion in which its base, i.e. the rule of anti-Dave, was formulated in struggle with the Medes/Kurds and all the cursed Daves in Vandidad are the Medi-an/Kurdish Izads (gods) and the families. Continuing the Dave calling of the Medes/Kurds, this book has introduced Mazdak as unclean (filth) and impure.
2. To get informed regarding the Kurd being of Mazdak and Maz-dakids, go to Chapter one, the historical generalities with regard to Mazdak.

#### The endnotes of chapter

1. One of the reasons for the widespread of mysticism in Kurdistan is that it is rooted in Mithraism; albeit, such a root is merely practical and not theoretical. It means that the practice of mysticism, that is, Sama' and losing one's consciousness is rooted in the dance and music in Mithraism caves; however, its religious meaning and appearance is in the same Iranian Mysticism culture which mysticized and solarized Mithra. The Sam'a in Mysticism is rooted in Mithraism dance and its real reproduction is still seen in the form of Halparka (Kurdish dance) but in Sama' it has acquired religious form and color but it is culturally Iranian/Zoroastrian in origin. If we have a look into the Takias (mysticism shrines or temples in Kurdistan), that the current writer himself (Qaderi) am from that sect and I am acquainted with them from near, we will observe that the Kurdish dance is merely practical and it is quite devoid from the content of Mystics and religious rituals. This paradox of the original Mithra and the Iranianized Mithra has still remained in the poems of the Iranian poets like Hafiz in which Kharabat, that is the place to worship and to purify the soul in mysticism, is described as the place of wine, drunkenness, butler in Hafiz poetries which signifies the remaining traces of the core of Mithraism in Iranian mysticism. Even up to the time of Hafiz and Sa'di, the traces or the remains of the former or prior Mithra has remained in Kharabats as there are some hints to the brothels or whorehouses, wine and beverages in the works of Hafiz, Sa'di and even Rashidadin Fazlollah (go to Hashim Razi, 1380: 205-206). Kharabs or Kharabat (Kharabad) are the ruined traces of the Mithraism temples which was turned into the Khanagas of Mysticism by the Iranian mystics. furthermore, there are some references or indications to the defences of the owners of the Mithraism Kharabats in front of mysticizing them: in the following Mo-lana (Maolavi) poetries:

A Kharbat (the guardian of the Mehr) from a Kharkhana (Mithraism temple) corner

Got his head out as a reproacher

This is a low speech meaning Masnavi

That is the prophet story, nothing more

There is no room for supreme secret words

So that the saints go far fast beyonds

Taken from beheading ranks up to the perdition

Step by step up to the God's visitation

Describing the constraints of every position  
 If he orders the wise to jump, he jumps soon  
 When the God's book descended on in The  
 heathens taunted this way in  
 Not see the appearance of Quran, O' boy  
 Dave do not see the man but just clay  
 The appearance of Quran is like the man in flesh and body  
 Whose forms and guise are alive and his soul is mystery  
 (Book 2, no202, Masnavi Mavlavi)

Kharbat is the guardian of Mehr, Mawlana says in this piece of poetry that the guardian of Mehr got his head out from the corner of the Kharabat and sarcastically said why you still speak of the prophet and following him and you have wrapped the higher mystery and Khar-bat in disguise (quoting from Razi, 138: 207). Here, the defence of Mithraists against mysticizing Kharabat is stated well and he Mehri guardian outcries that why you talk about the prophet, Quran, his say-ings and following him in this Kharabat. Comparing Masnavi to Quran and the guardian of the Mithraism temples to the heathen, Mawlavi claims that people only pay attention to the appearances and they are not able to interpret the gist and meaning of the instinct. In fact, those like Mawlana gave a mystical meaning to the Mithraism temples which were only practicing dancing, singing and playing music. They preserved the form of Mithraism dance and they called it Sama giving a mystical meaning to it and they devoided Mithraism and its ceremonies from inside giving them an Iranian/mystical connotation. This is the same Iranian/mystical Mithraism which is widespread in Kurdistan; thus, the Kurds have Mithra in the filter of Iranism and from the viewpoint of the Iranians. Nonetheless, the Kurds must try to know the real prior Mithra based on their own viewpoint. Besides, there are more examples in the poems of Kurdish Nezami in relation to this point:

Yesterday, I went to Kharabat, they did not let me in  
 I mourned and cried but no one heard in  
 Sooner or later than the middle of the night  
 A sober showed his head out from the house ...  
 This is no mosque, its door be open wide  
 Thou come late and stand in the first line  
 This is Mages' Kharabat, the sobers are there along  
 with love, candle, wine,, sweet, music and song  
 everyone on the world here are present and they hear



The believers, Berehmans, Gabers, Christians and Jews

Here, it is explicitly indicated that Kharbat is not the mosque and there are music, wine and song in it and there do not exist the religious clas-sification, ggodnees or evil and Ahorai (Zoroasteriaan God) or Ahri-man (Satanic) issues there and all people with every religion can attend it.

## References

- Abed-al Jaberi, Mohammad. (2011). The Formation of Arab Reason (Takvin-e aghl-e Arabi). Translated by Sayed Mohammad Al-e Mehdi. Tehran, Nasl-e Aftab Publication, 1389/2010.
- Abrahamian, Ervand. (1982). Iran Bain-e do Ingheab (Iran Between Two Revelutions). Translated by Golmohamadi, Ahmad. Tehran, Nay publication, 1380/ 2001.
- Abrahamian, Ervand. (1982). Oriental Despotism, Iran in Qajar Era (Istebdad-e Sharghi, Iran dar Ahd-e Qajar) in some articles on the socieology of Iran. Translated by Torabi, Soheila. Tehran, Shiraza Publi-cation, 1376/1997.
- Adorno, Theodor W and Max Horkheimer, (1944). Dailectic of En-lightenment (Dialectic-e Raoshangari). Translated by FarhadPour, Mo-rad and Omid-e Mehragan. Tehran, Gam-e Neo Publication, 1384/2005.
- Al-Jaberi, Mohammad A. (1984). Takvinn-e Aghle arabi (the Develop-ment of the Arabic Wisdom). Translated by S Mohammad Al-e Mahdi. Tehran, Nasl-e Aftab Publication, 1389/2010.
- Alikhani, Babak. (1384/2005). Mehr dar Iran ve Hind-e Bastan (Mithra in Ancient Iran and India). Majmoe maghalat, Edited.Tehran: Ghogh-noos.
- Abdol-allahi, Fershta. (1371/1992). Din-e zartosht ve naghsh-e an dar jama'a-ye Sasanian (The

- Religion of Zoroaster and its Role in the Society of Sassanids). Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication.
- Aeschylus, (1983). Prometheus **bound (promote dar zanjir)**. Translated by Shahrokh-e Maskob. Tehran, Nashr-e Andishe Publication, 1350/1971.
- Ahmadi, Babak. (1381/2002). Heidegger ve porsesh-e bonyadin (Heidegger, and the Fundamental Question). Tehran, Nashre Markaz Publication.
- Ahmadi, hamid. (1387/2008). Ghowm ve Ghowmgerai der Iran az Af-sane ta Vagheiyat (Ethnicity and Ethnicism in Iran). Tehran, Nashr-e Ney Publication.
- Aliev, Ighrar. (1960). The History of Media (padeshahi-ye Mad). Translated by Kambiz-e Mirbaha. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1388/2009.
- Ali, Ja'far. (2004). Nasiyonalizm ve nasiyonalism-e Kordi (National-ism and the Kurdish Nationalism). Solaymania, Rowshanbiri Ministry.
- Altheim, Franz and Ruth Stiehl (1954). *Ein asiatischer staat; Feudalismus unter den sasaniden und ihren nachbarn* (tarikh-e eghtesad-e dowlat-e sasani). Translated by Hoshang-e Sadeghi. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1382/2003.
- Arvidovich, E. G. (1977). Istoriia Irana (tarikh-e Iran az zaman-e bastan ta emroz). Translated by KayKhosrow Keshavarzi. Tehran, Mervarid Publication, 1359/1980.
- Azad, Abu- al-Kalam. (1344/1965). Zolqarni, Cyrus le Grand (Zolqarnin ya Korush-e Kabir). Translated by Bastani Parizi, M. Ibra-him. Tehran, Ibn-e Sina Publication.
- Amozgar, Zhale and Tafazoli. A. (1380/2001). Ostora-ye Zendagi-ye Zartosht (The Legend (Myth) of Zoroaster's Life). V.4. Tehran: Cheshma publication.
- Azkaii, Parviz. (1368/1989). Sagarti, Ghabila-ye Haftom-e Mad (Sagarti, the Seventh tribe of the Mede). Archaeology and History, No.2.
- Barthes, Roland (1915). Mythologies (Ostora-ye Imrooz). Translated by Shirindokht Daghighian. Tehran, Nashr Center Publication, 1375/1996.
- Barthold, V. V. (1984). A Historical Geography of Iran. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Barzan, Bave (2016). Afsana-ye Shamaran (The Legend of the Serpant King). Translated by SeifiKaran, Farzad. ?, Ronak Publication.
- Badi'I, Rabi'e. (1362/1983). Joghrafiya-ye Mofasal-e Iran (The Comprehensive geography of Iran). Tehran, Iqbal Publication.
- Badlisi, sharafkhan. (1860). Sharaf name, Tarikh-e Mofasal-e Kurdi-stan (Sharaf Name, the Comprehensive History of Kurdistan). With the Efforts of Zarnov, V Tehran, Scientific Publication, 1377/1998.
- Bagheri, Hedayat. (1378). Andishaha-ye Rozba firozabadi or Ibn-e Moghafa' (The thoughts of Rozba Firozabadi or Ibn-e Moghafa'). Shi-raz, Kian Nasr Publication.
- Bahar. Mehrdad. (1376/1997). Pazhoheshi dar Asatir-e Iran, Vol 2 (part 1&2). Tehran, Agah Publication.

Bahar. Mehrdad (1377/1998). *Az Ostora ta tarikh*, Vol4. Compiled and Edited by Ismailpour Abulghasem. Tehran, nashr-e Cheshma Publication.

Beck, Roger (2002-7-20). "Mithraism". *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Online Edition. Retrieved 2012-09-07.

Behtooi, Haidar. (1377/1998). *Kurd ve Parakndagi ou dar Gostara-ye Iranzamin* (Kurd and its Dispersion on the Scope of the Greater Iran). Tehran, Khojesta Publication.

Bironi, Abu-Reihan. (). *Asar-ol Baghia* (The Remaining Works (Trac-es)), Translated by Danaseresht, Akbar. Tehran, Ibn-e Sina Publication, 1352/ 1973.

Bivar, A.D.H. (2005): *Mithraism: A Religion for the Ancient Medes*. London, Iranika Antique.

Beladhuri, Yahya. (9th century). *Fetoh-ol Baladan, Bakhsh-e Marbot ba Iran* (The Conquest of the Lands, The Section Related to Iran). Translated by Azartash, Azarnosh, Edited by Farzan, Mohmmad. Tehran, Serosh Publication, 1364/1985.

Bosworth, C. E. (1963). *The Ghaznavids: 994-1040* (Tarikh-e Ghaznavian). Translated by Anoshe, Hassan. Tehran, Amirkabir Publication, 1356/1987

Bootby, Richard. (2001). *Freud be Masabah-e Filsof* (Freud as Philosopher). Translated by Soheil Sami. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1384/2005.

Boyce. Mary. (1982). *A History of Zoroastrianism* (tarikh-e Zartosht). Translated by Homayon San'atiZade, Vol.2. Tehran, Toos Publication, 1381/2002.

Boyce. Mary. (1992). *Zoroastrianism. Its Antiquity and Constant Vigour* (A'in-e Zartosht, Kohan Rozgar ve Ghodrat-e Mandegariyash). Translated by Abu-alhassan Tahami. Tehran, Negah Publication, 1386/2007.

Boyce, Mary. (1979). *Zoroastrians: their religious beliefs and practices* (Zartoshtian, Baverha ve Adab-e Dini-ye anha). Translated by: Asker Bahrami. Tehran: QoQnoos Publication, 1381/2002.

Boyce, Mary. (2001). *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. Routledge: London and New York.

Briant, Pierre (2002). *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Emperatory Hakhamaneshi, Vol1). Translated by Nahid Feroghan. Tehran, Farzan Rooz, Nasre Ghatra Co Publications, 1387/2008.

Burn, Lucilla, (1990). *Ostoeha-ye Yonani* (Greek Myths, the Legend-ary Past). Translated by Mokhber, Abbas. Tehran, Nasher markaz Publication, 1375i/ 1996i.

Brown, S. C. (1988). *The Medikos Logos of Herodotus and the Evolution of the Median State*, in H. Sancisi – Weerdenberg (ed.), *Achaemenid History* 3, Leiden.

Callinicos, Alex. (1983c). *The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx* (andisha-ye enghelabi-ye Karl Marx). Translated by Parviz Babaie. Tehran, Nashre ghatre, 1383/2004.

CallThe revolutionary ideas of Karl Marx, c 1983

- Cameron, George G. (1936). History of Early Iran (Iran dar sepidedam-e tarikh). Translated by Hassan-e Anosha. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1387/2008.
- Cassirer, Ernst. (n.d). The Myth of the State (ostora-ye dowlat). Translated by Yadolla-ye Movagen. Tehran, Hermes Publication, 1377/1998.
- Carr, H. (1961). What is History? (tarikh chist). Translated by hassan-e bamshad. Tehran, Kharazmi Publication, 1378/1999.
- Chalmers, Alan. (1976). What Is This Thing Called Science? (Chisti-ye Elm). Translated by Sai'd ZibaKalam. Tehran, SAMT Publication, 1387/2008.
- Champdor, Albert. (1952). Cyrus (Kourosh-e Kabir). Translated by Mohammad-e Ghazi. Zarin Pubication vol 1, 1384/2005.
- Chisholm, Hugh, ed. (1911). "Justin". Encyclopadia Britanica (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Christiensen, Arthur. (1925). Le regne du roi Kawadh et le communism Mazdakite (saltanat-e Ghobad ve zohor-e Mazdaki). Translated by Nasr-o- allah Falsafi.. Tehran, Mo'asesa-ye Khawar Publication, 1345/1966.
- Christiensen, Arthur. (1928). Etudes sur le Zoroastrisme de la Perse antique (Mazdaparasti dar Iran-e Ghadim). Translated by Zabiholah Safa. Tehran, Tehran University Press, vol2, 1345/1966.
- Christiensen, Arthur. (1944). L' Iran sous les Sassanides (Iran dar Zamn Sasanian). Translated by Rashid Yasami. Tehran: Seda-ye Mo'aser, 1382/2003.
- Christiensen, Arthur. (1941). The kayanians (kianian). Translated by Zabiholah Safa. Tehran, Katba Publication, vol2, 1343/1964.
- Childe, Gordon. (1970). The Aryans (aryaiha). Translated by Mohammad Taghi-ye Framerzi. Tehran, Negah Publication, 1390/2011.
- Clark, Peter. (2010). Zoroastrianism: An Introduction to an Ancient Faith. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010.
- Clauss, Manfred. (1990) The Roman cult of Mithras, München: Becks
- Clegg, Stewart. (1989). Frameworks of Power (charchobha-ye Ghodrat). Translated by Mostafa Yonesi. Tehran, Strategic Studies Publication, 1379/2000.
- Closca L, Bluta and ... (1978). Mithriacisme dans l'epigraphie de la Dacie. Etudes Mithriaques, Acta Iranica, 17 (din-e Mehr de iran-e bastan). Translated by Morteza Saqibfar. Tehran, Toos Publication, 1385/2006.
- Collingwood. R.J. (1946). The Idea of History (mafhom-e koli-ye tarikh). Translated by Ali Akbar-e Mahdian. Tehran, Oma Publication, 1389/2010
- Copleston, F. (2003). History of Philosophy, Vol8 (tarikh-e falsafa). Translated by Bahadin-e Khoramshahi. Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publication, 1388/2009.

تاریخ فلسفه، ج 8، ترجمه بهاءالدین خرمشاهی، تهران، شرکت انتشارات علمی و فرهنگی. (کاپلستون) 1388

Corbin, Henry. (1946). *Les Motifs Zoroastriens dans la philosophie de Sohrawardi shaykh-olIshraq* (bonmayaha-ye a'ien-e zartosht dar andi-sha-ye Sohrawardi). Translated by Mahmmod Behferozie. Tehran: Jami Publication, 1384/2005

Cottam, Richard W, (1964). *Nationalism in Iran* (nasiyonalism dar Iran). Translated by Ahmade Tadayon. Tehran, kavir Publication, 1375/1996.

Cook, Emanuel J. (1983). *The Persian Empire* (tashkil-e ahahanshahi-ye hakhamaneshian). Translted by Morteza Saqibfar. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1389.2010.

Cumont, Franz Valeri Marie. (). *The Mystries of Mithra* (a'ien-e por ramz o raz-e Mitraie: razha-ye mitra). Collected and translted by Hashem Razi. Tehran, Behjat Publication, 1381/2002.

Curtis, Vesta Sarkhosh (2005), *Persian Mythe* (Ostoreha-ye Irani). Translated by Abas Mokhber. Tehran: Nashr-e Markaz Publication, 1373/1994.

Dabir Siyaghi, Saed Mohammad. (138/2001). *Bargardan-e ravayat gona-ye Shaname of Ferdowsi* (A Narative-like Transformation of Ferdowsi's Shahnama). Tehran, Ghatra Publication.

Dandamayev, M. A. (1963). *Tarikh-e Iran dar dowra-e nekhostin-e padeshahi-ye Hakhamaneshyan* (Iran under the Early Achamanids). Translated by Roohi Arbab. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1373/1994.

Dandamayev, M. A. (1989). *A Political history of the Achaimened Empire*, translated into English by W.J. Wogelsang. NEW YORK.

DarMester, James. (1849-1894). *The Interpretation of Avesta* (Tafsir-e Avesta). Translated by Mosa, Javan vol1. Tehran, Donya-ye Ketab, 1382/2003.

Dartigues, Andre. (1972) *Quest-ce que la Phonomonologie?* (padidarshenasi chist?). Tanslated by Mahmoud-e Nevali. Tehran, SAMT Publication, 1387/2008.

Debevoise, N. carl. (1903). *Tarikh-e Siasi-ye Part or Ashkaniyan* (A Political history of Parthia). Translated by Hekmat, Ali Asghar. tehran, Ibn-e Sina Publication, 1342/1963.

Dehbashi, Ali. (1388/2009). *Zendagi ve Andisha-ye Zarosht, Sayri dar Zendagi ve Amozahaye Zartosht, Vol 3* (Zoroaster and his Life, A survey on Zoroaster's Life and Teachings, Vol 3). Tehran, Afkar Publi-cation.

Deleuze. Gille. ().

Diakonoff, I.M. (1985). *The Median History* (Tarikh-e Ma:d). Translated by Karim Keshavarz. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1379/2000.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. & Paul Rabinow (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (mishel foko: faraso-ye sakhtgera-ie ve hemontetics). Translated by Hossein Bashiriya. Tehran, nashr-e Nay Publication, 1379/2000.

Durant, William James. (1885). *The Story of Civilization* (tarikh-e tamadon). Translated by Ahmad Aram and ... . Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1378/1999.

Dunker, M. (1867). *geschichte des Altertums*, Bd II.

Eagleton, Terry. (1991). *Idiology:an Introduction (daramadi bar idoloji)*. Translated by Akbar Ma'sombeygi. Tehran, Agah Publication, 1381/2002.

Edmonds, C. J. (1957). *Kurds, Turks and Arabs: Politics, Travel and Research in North- Eastern Iraq 1919-1925*. Translated by Yonesi, Ebrahim. Tehran. Rozbahan Publication, 1363/1984.

Ehtesham, Morteza. (1355/1976). *Iran dar Zaman-e Hakhamaneshiyan (Iran in Achamanids era)*. Tehran, Habibi Publication.

Elima, Be'var (1379/2000). *Akharin Mosta'mera, Bohran Kurdistan- Turkia az Aghaz ta Konon (The last Colony, the Crisis in Kurdistan of Turkey from the begging up to now)*. Tehran, Pazhohanda Publication.

Enayat, Hamid, (1982). *Modern Islamic Political Thought (Andisha-ye siasi-ye islam-e mo'aser)*. Translated by bahaa din-e Khoramshahi. Teh-ran, Kharazmi Publicaation.

Erfanmanesh, Jalil. (1388/2009). *Zolqarnain, Kourosch ve bazafarini hoviyat-e meli, jelde 2 (Zolqarnain, Cyrus and the recreation of the Na-tional Identity, vol2)*. Tehran, farhang-e Maktoob Publication.

Esmailpour, Abolqassem. (1377/1998). *Ostore, bayan-e nemadin (Mythe: the Symbolic Expressions)*. Tehran, Soroush Publicatin.

Fakhori, Hana & Khalil –Aljar (). *Tarikh-e falsafa-ye Isami (The Histo-ry of the Islamic philosophy)*. Translated by Abdu-al Mohammad-e Ayati. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1381/2002.

FarshadMehr, Nahid. (1385/2006). *Kourosch-e Hakhamaneshi (Achamanids Cyrus)*. Tehran, Mohammad Publication.

Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Critical Language Awareness*. London: longman

Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discoursal and Social Change: A Conflictual View*.Cambridge: Policy Press.

Feirahi, Dawoud. (1378/1999). *Ghodrat, danesh ve mashro'iat dar Is-lam (Power, Knowedge and Ligitimacy in Islam)*. Tehran, Nashr-e Nay Publication

Felipe, Fernandez. A. (2004). *Word of Myths (jehan—e ostoreha)*. Translated by Abbas-e Mokhber. Tehran, Nashr-e Markaz Publication, 1385/2006.

Ferdowsi, Abu Alghasem. (1378/1999). *Shahnama, based on Volume 9 Edition Printed in Mosko under the Supervision of Y. A, Bertls*. Teh-ran, Qoqnoos publication, 1378/1999.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish (moraghebat ve tanbih)*. Translated by Yahya Imami. Tehran, Nashr-e Nay Publication, 1386.

Foucault, M. (1972). *Histoire de la folie a l'age classique (tarikh-e jo-non dar asr-e klasik)*. Translated by Fatema Valiani. Tehran, Hermes Publication, 1388/2009.

Foucault, M. (1964). *Nietzsche, Freud, Marx (Niche, Freud ve Marks)*. Translated by Afshin jahandida and colleagues. Tehran, Hermes Publi-cation, 1383/2004.

Frye, Richard. N. (1963). *The Heritage of Persia (miras-e bastani-ye Iran)*. Translated by Mas'oud-e Rajabnia. Tehran, Bongah-e tarjome ve nashr-e Kitab, 1344/1965.

Frye, Richard. N. (1974). *tarikh-e Iran az feropashi-ye Sasanian ta amadan-e Saljoghiyan*, jeld 4 (Cambridge History, the History of Iran from the Collapse of Sassanids to the Adven of Saljughids, Vol 4). Translated by Hassan-e Anoshe. Tehran, AmirKabir Publication, 1379/2000.

Garthwaite, Gene R. (2004). *The Persians (tarikh-e siasi-ye iran az hakhamanesh takonon)*. Translated by GholamReza Alibabaie. Tehran, Akhtaran Publication, 1385/2006.

Genito, B. (1986 ). "The Medes: A Reassessment of the Archaeological Evidence," East and West 36/1 - 3.

Gershevitch, I (editor). (1985). *The Cambridge history of Iran, vol2: The Median and Achaemenian Periods (tarikh-e iran-e kambridge, jeld-e 2: do-raha-ye mad ve hakhamaneshi)*. Translated by Taimour-e Ghaderi. Tehran, Mehtab Publication, 1387/2008.

Gharib, adr-al Zaman. (1386/2007). *Motale'at-e Soghdi (The Soghdian Studies)*. With the Efforts of Mohammad Shokri-ye Fomeshi. Tehran, Tahori Publication.

Ghasemlo, Abdurahman. (1381/2002). *Chel sal khabat la penawi azadi (Forty years of Struggle for the Sake of Freedom)*. The Center for the Publications of KDP.

GhaziMoradi, Hassan. (1389/2010). *Istebdad dar Iran (The Despoti-cism in Iran)*. Tehran, Oma Book Publication.

GhaziMoradi, Hassan. (1386/2007). *Ta'moli bar aghabmandegi-ye ma (A Contemparation on our Backwardedness)*. Tehran, Oma Book Publica-tion.

Gibb, H.A.Rs. (1962). *Studies on the civilization of islam*, London, 1962

ValiGholizad, Ali. (1387/2008). *Barrasi ve tahlil-e zirsakhtha-ye amniyati der manateghe marzi-ye iran*. Oromia, pamphlet of the conference on Security and Border.

Gnoli, Ghrardo. (1989). *Ida-ye Iran der Khodkavi-ye meli der asr-e jahani shodan be vasila-ye Mohsen-e Rahyab ve digaran (The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Its Origion in National SelfSurveying in the Global-ization Age by Mohsen-e Rahyab and the Others)*. Tehran, Ghasidesara Publication, 1381/2002.

Gnoli, Ghrardo (1980). *Zoroaster's Time and Homeland: A Study on the Origins of Mazdeism and Related Problems (Zaman ve Zadgah-e Zartosht, Pazhoreshi der bara-ye zartoshtigeraie)*. Translted by Seyd Mansour Seyd Sajad. Agah Publication, 1381/2002.

Gnoli, G. (1989). *The Idea of Iran, An essay on its origin*, SOR, LXLL, ROME.

Godarzi, Hossein. (1384/2005). *Zaban ve hoviat (language and Identi-ty)*. Tehran, National studies

Institute.

Gershevitch, Ilya. (1985). *The Cambridge History of Iran. Volume 2: The Median and Achaemenian Periods*. Translated by Bahram-e Shalgoni. Tehran, Jami Publication, 1387/2008.

- Grigorevich, Veladmir. Lukonin (1969a). (*Civilization of Sassanid Iran*). *Cul'tura sasanidskogo Irana. Iran v III-V vv.* (Culture of Sasanian Iran: Iran in the 3rd-5th centuries CE), Moscow, translated into Persian by 'Enāyat-Allāh Rezā as *Tamaddon-e Irān-e Sāsāni*, Tehran, 1971.
- Grishman, R. (1976). *L'Iran des origines à l'islam (iran az aghaz ta is-lam)*. Translated by Mohammad Moin. Tehran, Scientific Cultural Publication, 1388/2009., Page 65
- Grishman, R. (1964). *The Arts of Ancient Iran: from its origions to the Time of Alexander the Great ((honar-e iran dar dowran Mad ve Hakhamaneshi)*. Translated by Isa Behnam. Tehran, Scientific Cultural Publication, 1390/2011.
- Guillmin, j. D. (1953). *Ormazd et Ahriman Ormazd ve Ahriman, majeray Dogane Bavari dar Ahde bastan. Vol:1.* Translated by Abas Bagheri. Tehran: Nashr- o Pazhoresh-e Farzan Roz, 1378/1999.
- Guillmin, j. D. (1973). *The Western Response to Zoroaster (Zartosht ve Jahan-e Gharb). Vol:2.* Translated by Masod RajabNia. Tehran, Morvarid Publication, 1363/1984.
- Haghighat, Abdu-al- Rafi'e. (1381s). *Tarikh-e nehzatha-ye meli-ye iran, az hama-ye tazian ta zohor safarian (The History of National Movements in Iran, From the Assault of Arabs to the Advent of Safarids)*. Tehran, Sceintific Publication.
- Hamavi, Yaghot. (). *Mo'jam-Al –Baladan (the information about the Cities)*. Translated by Ali naghi-ye Menzavi. Tehran, 2001.
- Hamavi, Yaghot. (1362/1983). *Bargozide-ye moshtarak-e Yaghot-e Hamavi (A Common Abstract of Yaghot-e Hamavi)*. Transalted by Mohammad Parvin-e Gonabadi. Tehran, AmirKabir Publication.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. (1807). *Phanomenologie des Geistes (padidarshenasi-ye roh)*. Translated by Ziba Jabali. Tehran, Shafi'ie Publication 1382/2003.
- Henning, W.B. (1951). *Zoroaster, Politicion or Witch-Doctor (Zartosht Sisatmadar ya Jadogar)*. Translated by Kamran Fani. Tehran: Nashr-e Kitab-e Parwaz, 1364/1985.
- Hertel, Johannes. (1924). Achaemeniden und Kayaniden: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Irans (IIQF 5), Leipzig.*
- Herodotus (1987). *The History (tarikh-e Herodet)* Translted by Vahid Mazandarani. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1384/2005.
- Hinnels, John Russel (eds). (1971). *Mithraic studies: Proceedings of the First Iternational Congress of Mithraic Studies (Din-e Mehr dar Iran-e Bastan)*. Translated by Morteza Saghbi Far. Tehran, Toos Publi-cation, 1385/2006.
- Heidemarie Koch. (1992). *Es kündet Dareios der König In German or So Says King Darius ... Life in the Persian Empire (az zaban-e Daruis)*. Translated by parviz-e Rajabi. Tehran, Karang Publication, n.d.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Sein Und Zeit or Being and Time (hasti ve Zaman)*. Translated by Siavash-e Jamadi. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1383/2004.
- Helm, P. R. (1981). *Herodotu's Medikos Logos and Median History », Iran 19.*



- Hinnells, John R., ed. (1971). *Mithraic Studies*, vol. 2. Manchester University Press. Plate 25
- Herzfeld, (1936). *Archaeological history of Iran (tarikh-e bastani-ye iran bar bonyad-e bastanshenasi)*. Translated by Ali Asghar-e Hekmat. Tehran, Association of National Works, 1354/1975.
- Hinz, Walther (1969). *Altiranische Funde und Forschungen (yaftaha-ye taze az Iran-e bastan)*. Translated by Parviz Rajabi. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1385/2006.
- Hinz, Walther (1936). *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert (tashkil-e dolat-e meli der Iran)*. Translated by Kaykaous-e Jahandari. Tehran, Kharazmi Publication, 1361/1982.
- Hinz, Walther. (1978). *Darius und die Perser (Daryosh ve Iranian: Tarikh Farhang ve Tamadon-e Hakhameneshian. Vol:1 & 2)*. Translated by Parviz Rajabi. Tehran, Nashr-e Mahi Publication, 1386/2007.
- Hinnells, John R. (1997). *Persian Mythology (Shenakht-e Asatir-e Iran, Vol:10)*. Translated by Zhala-e Amozgar ve Ahmad Tafazoli. Tehran, Cheshme Publication, 1385/2006.
- Homer, Sean. (2005). *Jacques Lacan (zhak lakan)*. Translated by Mohammad Ebrahim Tahaie and Mohammad Ali Ja'fari. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1388/2009.
- Huart, Clement. (1925). *La Perse antique et la civilization iranienne, vol 3 (Iran ve tamdon-e Irani)*. Translated by Hassan-e Anosha. Tehran, Amir Kabir Publication, 1379/2000.
- Humbach, H. (1991). *The Gathas of zarathushtra and other Old Avesta Text, part I*, Heidelberg, 1991 MgoSoft
- Hume, E. Robert. (1924). *The World's Living Religions (adyan-e zenda-ye jahan)*, Translated by Abdu-al- Rahim-e Gavahi. Tehran, The Office for the Publication of Islamic Thought, 1369/1990.
- Ibn-e Asir, Izadin. *Tarikh-e Kamel (The Complete history)*. Translated by Rohani, Said Hossain. Tehran, Asatir Publication, 1370/1991.
- Ibn-e Asir, Kamel. *Akhbar-e Iran (The News of Iran)*. Translated by Bastani Parizi, M.E. Tehran, Ilm Publication, 1365/1986.
- Ibn-e Nadim, (n.d). *Alfehrest (The list)*. Translated by Mo-hammad Reza Tajadod. Tehran, Amir Kabir Publication, 1368/1989.
- Ibn-e Maskoya, Ahmad. (n.d). *Tajarob-al-Omam (the Experiences of the Nations)*. Translated by Ali Naghi-ye Menzavi. Tehran, Toos Publication, 1376/1997.
- Isfahani, Hasan. Hamza Bin. (1367/1988). *Tarikh-e Payambaran ve Shahan (The history of the Prophets and the Kings)*. Translated by Jafar Sho'ar. Vol.2. Tehran, Amirkabir Publication, 1367/1988.
- Irandoost, Manochehr. (1375/1996). *Shah Ismail-e Aval (King Ismail the first)*. Tehran, Inteshar Sharing Co Publication.
- Inostrantsev, Konstantin. (1909). *Etudes Sassanids (ahghighati darbar-ye Sasanian)*. Translated by Kazemzade, Kazem. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication, 1384/2005.

Ivanov M. S. and Colleagues (1965). Novejshaya istoriya Irana./Ivanov M. C. The latest history of Iran (tarikhe iran: iran-e bastan). Translated by Siros-e Izadi ve Hossein-e Tahvili. Tehran, Donya Publication, 1359/1980.

Jarir-e tabari, Mohammad. (1375/1996). Tarikh-e Tabari ya Tarikh-o Alresol ve Al-Molok (Tabari History or The History of the prophets and the Kings). Translated by Payande, Abu Alghasem. Tehran, Asatir Publication.

Ja'faryan, Rasool. (1377/1998). Az tolo'-e Taheryan ta ghorob-e Khar-zamshahian, Vol2 (From the Rise of Taheryan to the Sunset (Fall) of Kharzamshahian, Vol 2). Tehran, the Institute of Knowledge Culture and Contemporary Thought.

Jalaipour, HamidReza. (1372/1993). Kurdistan ve ellal-e tadavom-e bohran-e an pas az enghelab-e islami (Kurdistan and the Reasons be-hind the Continuation of its Crises after the Islamic Revelation). Teh-ran, The Office for the Political Studies of Foreign Ministry.

Jackson, Howard M. (1985). "The Meaning and Function of the Leonto-cephaline in Roman Mithraism" in Numen, Vol. 32, Fasc. 1 (Jul., ), pp. 17–45.

Jaspers, Carl. (1953). The Origin and goal of History (aghaz ve anjam-e tarikh). Translated by Mohammad Hassan-e Lotfi. Tehran, Kharazmi Publication, 1373/1994.

Jenkins, Jennifer. (2011), Excavating Zaratustra: Ernst hertzfeld's Ar-chaelological history of iran, Iranian studies, London, 1072954 Registered.

Jeremy A, Black. (1992). Gods, Demons and symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: university of Texas press.

Jong, D. A. (1997). Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature. (Religions in the Graeco - Roman world 133.) Lei-den/New York: Brill

Jorgensen, Marianne and Louise Philips (2002). Discourse analysis as theory and method (nazari-ye ve ravesh dar tahlil-e gofteman). Translated by Hadi-ye Jalili. Tehran, Nashr- e Nay Publication, 1389/2010.

Junge, Peter Julius. (1944). Dareios I. König der Perser (. pādšāh-e pārs-hā, Dāryuš-e yakom). Translated by. D. Monšizāda (1957). Teh-ran, Nashr-e Sales, 1385/2006.

Khodadadian, Ardashir (1378/1999). Hakhamaneshiha (The Achama-nids). Tehran, Behdid Publication.

Kelly, Michael. (1994). Criticand Power: Recasting the Fo-cault/Habermas Debate (naghd ve ghodrat: bazafarin-ye monazera-ye foko ve habermas). Translated by Farzan-e Sejodi. Tehran, akhtaran Publication, 1385/2006.

Kent, Roland G. (1953). Old Persian. Neve haven, American Oriental societys

جادوی گفتار، ذهنیت فرهنگی و نظام معانی در انتخابات دوم خرداد، محمدجواد غلامرضا کاشی، تهران:

مؤسسه فرهنگی آینده پویان تهران، 1381،

Klima, Otaker. (1957). The History of Mazdak Movement (tarikhcha-ye Jonbesh-e Mazdak). Translated by Jahangir-e Fekri Ershad. Tehran, Toos Publication, 1371/1992.

Klima, Otaker. (1977). Mazdak, The History of social Movement in Sassanids Era (tarikh-e Jonbesh-e Mazdakian). Translated by Jahangir-e Fekri Ershad. Tehran, Toos Publication, 1373/1994.

Kvtschera, Chris. (1979). L Mouvement National Kurd (jonbesh-e meli-ye Kurd). Translated by Ebrahim-e Yonesi. Tehran, Negah Publi-cation, 1377/1998.

Kia, Khojesta. (1369/1990). Shahname-ye Ferdowsi (The Stories of the Kings). Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication.

Khalil, Mahmood. (2011). Mezho-i Kurd le sharestani islamida, Vol 2 (The History of the Kurd in the Islamic Civilization, Vol 2). Translated into Kurdish by Reza Ali. Soleimania, Payvand Publication

Khaleghi, Ahmad. (1382/2003). Ghodrat, zaban, zendagi-ye rozmare (Power, Language, Daily Life). Tehran, Game- No Publication.

Khonji, Ali. (1358/1979). Resala-I dar barrai-ye tarikh-e Mad (A Pamphlet on Studying the Mede History). Tehran, Tahori Publication.

Katouzian, Homayon. (1380/2001). State and Society in Iran (Tazad-e dowlat ve melat). Translated by AliReza Tayeb. Nashr-e Nay Publication.

Katouzian, Homayon. (2010). The Persians: Ancient, Mediaval and Modern Iran (Iranian: az dowra-ye bastan ta mo'aser). Translated by Hosseinn-e Shahidi. Tehran, nashr-e Markaz Publication, 1392/ 2013.

Karbasian, Maliha and Mohammad Karimi Z. A. (1384/2005). bod'atgeraie ve zendegha dar iran-e ahd-e sasani (Heresism and Heterodoxy in Iran of Sassanids Era). Tehran, Akhtaran Publication.

خاستگاه های انسان مدرن: میثقی واضح و در عین حال بغرنج

فریدون بیگلری: مترجم جفری کلارک: نویسنده

باستان پژوهی 1378 دی شماره 7: منبع

Geoffrey A Clark, Catherine M Willermet (1997). Conceptual Issues in Modern Human Origins research (khastgahha-ye ensan-e modern. Translated by Feridon Biglari. Bastanpazhohi, 1378/2009 (7).

Konig, F. (1953). Die alteste Geschichte der meder und perser.

Kramer, Samuel N. (1956). From the Tablets of Sumer (alvah-e su-meri). Translated by Davoud-e Rasaie. Tehran, Scientific Cultural Pub-lication, 1383.

Kasravi, Ahmad. (1377/1998). Shahriaran-e Gomnam, jeld-e 6 (Anon-ymus Shahriars or Soverreigns, vol6). Tehran, Jami Publication.

Kasravi, Ahmad. (1353/1974). Sheikh-e safi ve tabarash (Sheikh Safi and His Dynesty). With th Efforts of Yahya Zaka. Tehran, AmirKabir Publication.

Kasravi, Ahmad. (1356/1977). Karvand-e kasravi (The Anthology of Kasravi). Tehran, Habibi's Books Co.

Kuhrt, A. (2007). The Persian Empire: A Corpus of sources from the Achaemenid period. NEW YORK: Routledge.

Lamb, Harold. (1960). *Cyrus the Great (koroush-e Kabir)*. Translated by Sadeq-e Rezazada Shafaq. Tehran, Mo'ain Publication, 1385/2006.

Langrodi, Reza. (1384/2005). *Jonbeshha-ye ejtemaie dar iran pas az islam (Social Movements in Iran after Islam)*. Tehran, Nashre- No Publication.

Lazarov, N. (1930). *The History of Kurdistan in Russian (mizhoy Kurdistan in Kurdish)*. Translated into Kurdish by Weshyar Abdollah Sangavi, Vol2. Hewler, Rojhalat Publication, 2010.

Liverani, M. (2003). "Rise and Fall of Media," in *Continuity of Empire (?): Assyria, Media, Persia* edited by G. B. Lafranchi et al., 1–12. Padova: Sargon Editrice e Libreria.

Lukonin, Vladimir G. (1969a). *Kul'tura sasanidskogo Irana. Iran v III-V vv. (Culture of Sasanian Iran: Iran in the 3rd-5th centuries CE)*. translated into Persian by 'Enāyat-Allāh Reżā as Tamaddon-e Irān-e Sāsāni. Tehran, 1365/19986.

Levine, L. D. (1987). *The Iron Age*. In *The Archaeology of Western Iran*, edited by F. Hole (asr-e ahan dar bastan shenasi-ye gharb-e Iran). Translated by Zahra Bastani. Tehran, Samt Publication, 1381/2002.

Löwith, Karl (1965). *From Hegel to Nietzsche (az hegel ta nitcha)*. Translated by .Hassan-e Mortazavi. Tehran, Akhtaran Publication, 1388/2009.

Lukacs, G. (1974) : *Soul and Form (jan ve sorat)*. Trans. by Reza Rezaie. Tehran, Nashr-e mahi, 1382/2003.

Madelung, A. (1997). *The Successtion to Mohammad (janeshini-ye Payamber)*. Translated by Ahmad-e Namaie. Mashad, Astan-e Qods-e Razavi Publication, 1379/2000.

Marr, Yuri. N. (

Marr, Andrew. (2012-). *The history of the World's B.B.C Ceries*.

Marx, Karl (1843). ***Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*** (*Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie*). Marxists Internet Archive.

Marx, Karl (1888). *Ad Feuerbach (Theses on Feuerbach)*. Translated by Cyril Smith 2002. Marxists Internet Archive

Mazzaoui, Michael. (1972). *The Origions of the Safavids (paydayesh-e Dowlat-e Safavia)*. Translated by Yaghob-e Azhand. Tehran, Nashr-e Gostarda Publication, 1363/1984.

Markwart, Josef. (1901). *Eranasahr nach der Geographie desps. Moses xorenaci (Iranshahr bar mabna-ye joghrafiya-ye mosa Khorni)*. Translated by Maryam-e MirAhmadi. Tehran, Etela'at publication, vol1, 1373/1994.

Masoudi, Ali-bn-e Hossein. (1370/1991). *Mervaj-al Zahab*. Translated by Abu-al Hossein payande. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication.

(2008/1387). Masoudnia, Hossein  
 j. اریخ به مثابه گفتمان، بازکاوی رابطه گفتمان تاریخی و سیاسی در ایران معاصر

**Spring 1387, NO:13**

Maghdasi, Motahar Bin-e taher. (?). *Afarinesh ve Tarikh (The Creation and History)*. Translated by Mohammad Reza Shafi'ie-ye Kadkani. Tehran, The Foundation of Iran Culture, 1359/1980.

Myers, Tony. (2003). Slavij Zizek (slavi zhizhak). Translated by Ehsan-e Nowrozi. Tehran, nashre Markaz Publication, 1375/1996.

Mohammadi Malayeri, M. (1375/1996). Tarikh ve farhang-e iran dar dowran-e enteghal az asre sasani ba asr-e eslami. Del-e iranshahr, jeld-e 2 (The history and Culture of Iran in the eras of Transmission from Sassanid time to Islamic Time. Te Hear of Iranshahr (the Greater Iran), vol2). Tehran, Toos Publication.

Merquior, J.G. (1987). Foucault (mishel foko). Translated by Nazi-ye Azimi. Tehran. Karnama Publication, 1389/2010.

Mas'odi, Abu-alhassan Ali Bin-e Hossein, (1370). Merwaj-al-Zahab, jeld 2 (). Translated by Abu-alGhasem-e Payanda. Tehran, Scientific-cultural Publication.

Maskob, Shahrokh. (2536). Moghadamaie bar Rostam ve Isfandiyar, Jeld-e 5 (An Introduction to Rostam and Esfandya, vol5). Tehran, Franklin Publication

Mashkor, M Javad. (1375/1996). Nazari be tarikh-e Azarbaijan (A look at the History of Azarbaijan). Tehran, Kakhkashan Publication.

Mefrad Kahlan, Javad. (1375/1996). Gozaresh-e zadgah-e zartosht ve tarikh-e asatiri-ye Iran, Jeld-e 1 (A Report on the Homeland of Zoroas-ter and the mythical History of Iran, vol1). Tehran, Negin Publication.

Moghadam, Mohammad. (1380/2001). Jastari dar Bara-ye Mehr ve Nahid (A Survey on Mehr and Nahid). Tehran: Hirmand Publication.

Mofrade Kahlan, Javad. (1375/1996). Gozaresh-e zadgah-e zartosht ve tarikh-e asatir-e iran. Tehran, Negin Publication.

McDowall, David, (1996). A Modern History of the Kurds (tarikh-e mo'aser-e Kurd). Translated by Ebrahim-e Yonesi. Tehran, Paniz Pub-lication, 1380/2001.

Movally, Keramat. (1383/2004). Mabani-ye ravankavi-ye Freud- Lakan (The Foundations of Freud-Lacan's Psychoanalysis). Tehran, Nashr-e Ney Publication.

Mehrvarz, Abas. A and Nouradin-e Ne'mati. (1390/2011). Ta'sir-e sia-sat dr tadvin ve gostarsh-e Mazdaknamaha (The Influence of Politicts in the Composition and Development of Mazdaknamas). Iraniological Studies, Year 1 (1).

Messina, Giuseppe. (1929). "La dottrina manichea delle origini e la reli-gione cristiana," Biblica 10, 1929, pp. 313-34.

Mallowan, M.E.L. (1965). Early Mesopotamia and Iran (bein-o- nahrein ve Iran-e bastan). Translated by reza Mostofi. Tehran, Tehran University, 1376/1997.

Mirzaie, Ghafour. (1379/2000). Emrooz dar Esarat-e dirooz, barrasi-ye avamel-e sazand-ye sakhtar-e hekomati ve farhangi-ye dar Iran (Today in the Prison of Yesterday, Investigating the Constructive Factors of the Governmental and Cultural Structure in Iran). Tehran, A'taie Publication.

Miller, Peter. (1987). Domination and Power (sozhe, estila ve Ghodrat). Translated by Niko Sarkhosh ve Afshin-e Jahandide. Teh-ran, Nashr-e Ney Publication.

Minorsky, V.F. (1958). A History of Sharvan and Darband in the 10th-11th Centuries. Translated by Mohsen Khadem. Tehran, Ketab-e Marja' publication, 1387/2008.

Minorsky, V.F. (1944). Roman and Byzantine Campaigns in Atropatene. Translated by Roghye Behzadi, Tehran, Pazhohande Publication, 1378/1999.

Minorsky, V.F. (1953). Studies in Caucasian history: a New Light on Shaddadids of Ganja Li, Shaddadids of Anni Lii : Prehistory of Saladin. Translated by Mohsen Khadem. Tehran, Tehran, Ketab-eMarja' publication, 1387/2008.

Minoi, Mojtaba. (1354/1975). Nama-ye tansar be Goshtaseb (Tansar's Letter to Goshtaseb). Tehran, Kharazmi Publication.

Munson, Rosaria Vignolo. (2009). Who Are Herodotus. Per-sians, Classical World Volume 102, Issue 4.

Naderi, Nader. (2005). The Case of the Early Abbasid Caliphate (ba-ra'madan-e Abbasian, idoloji-ye mazhabi ve iqtedar-e siasi). Translated by A.H. Azarang and Negar Naderi. Tehran, Sokhan Publication.

Nezam-al Molk, Xaje (). The Seyr al-Muluk or Siasatnameh. Edited by Hubert Darke in 1961. Tehran, Bongah Publication, 1372/1993.

Ne'mani, Farhad. (1385/2006). Takamol-e Feodalism der Iran (The Evollution of Feudalism in Iran). Tehran, Kharazmi Publication.

Naghavi, Sayed Ali Mehdi. (n.d). Aghayed-e Mazdak (Mazdak's Beleifs). Tehran, Ata'ie Press Institute

Nafisi, Sa'eed. (1331/1952). Tarikh-e tamadon-e Iran-e Sasani (The history of Iran Civilisation of Sasanids). Tehran, Tehran University Press

Nafisi, Sa'eed. (1392/2013). Babak-e Khoramdin, delaver-e Azabaijan (Babak of Khoramdin, The hero of Azarbaijan). Tehran, Arvand Publication.

Nigosian, Solomon (1993), The Zoroastrian faith: tradition and modern research,

McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 15, ISBN 978-0-7735-1144-6

Nietzsche, F. (1887). J Zur Genealogie der Moral (tabarshenasi-ye ekhlagh). Translated by Daruish Ashori . Tehran, Agah Publication, 1377/1998.

Nietzsche, F. (1901). The Will to Power (irada-ye ma'tof be ghodrat). Translated by Mohammad Bagher-e Hoshyar. Tehran, Ferozan Rooz publication, 1377/1998.

Nouri, Ahmad. (1380/2001). Pishdadian ve Kianian (Pishdadians and Kianians). Tehran, Mersa Publication.

Noldeke, T. (1973). Geschichte du Parser und Araber zur zeit des Sas-aniden (tarikh-e Iranian ve Arabha der zaman-e sasanian). Translated by Abbas Zaryab Khoie. Tehran, National Works Associations, 1358/1979.

Noldeke, T. (1979). The Iranian National Epic or Shahnama Hamasa-ye Meli-ye Iran. Vol:3. Trans: Bozorg-e Alavi ve Saeed-e Nafisi. Teh-ran, Nashr-e Sipehr Publication, 1358/1979.

Nyberg, S. H (1938). *Die Religionen des Alten Iran, Zoroaster in History* (dinha-ye Iran-e bastan, Zartosht dar tarikh). Translated by Saifa-din-e Najm Abadi. Tehran, The Iranian Center for Studying Cultures, 1359/1980.

Nyberg, S. H (1954). *DASREICH DER ACHAMENIDEN, HISTORIA MUNDIII*. BERN MUNCHEN, S. 67.

Nikbakht, Rahim. (1387/2008). *Naghsh-e Azarbaijan der tahkim-e Hoviat-e Iran* (The Role of Azarbaijan in Solidating the Identity of Iran). Tehran, The ffice for Social Planning and Cultural Studies.

Nikitin. B. (1956). *Les Kurdes: Étude Sociologique et Historiqu* (Kurd va Kurdistān: bar'rasī az naẓar-i jāmi'ah'shināsī va tārikhī). Translated by Muḥammad Qāẓ ī. Tehran, derayat Publication, 1377/1998.

Newly. G. (n. d). *Zaman ve Zadgah-e Zartosht*. Trans: Sayd Mansoor Sayd Sajad. Tehran: Ageh Publication, 1381/2002.

Nezam-al Molk, Xaje (). *The Seyr al-Muluk or Siasatnameh*. Edited by Hubert Darke in 1961. Tehran, Bongah Publication, 1372/1993.

O'Balance, Edgar (1971). *The Kurdish revolt 1961 – 1970*. Translaed by Fatah-e Ghazi. Tehran, Negah Publication, 1377/1998.

Ocalan, A. *Az Dolat-e Kaheni Somer be Soye Tamadon-e democratic* (From Sumerian Priesthold Government towards democratic civiliza-tion). Translated into Persian by Democratic Enlightenment Union. Democratic Enlightenment Union Publication, 1381/2002.

Olmstead, Albert T. (1948). *The History of Persian Empire* (Tarikhe Shahanshahi Hakhamaneshi). Treanslated by Mohammad Moghadam. Tehran, Amirkabir Publication, 1384/2005.

Olmstead, Albert T. (1938). *Darius and his Behistun inscription*. AJSL

Olsen, Robert. (1991). *The Emergence of Kurdish Nationalism and the Sheikh Said Rebellion, 1880–1925* in Paperback.

Oppert, J. (1879). *Le Peuple et la Langue des Mèdes*". Paris,

Oranski, I. M. (1960). *An introduction to Iranian Philology*. Translated by Keshavarz, Karim. Tehran, Payam Publication, 1382/ 2003.

Petroshevesky, I. P. (1985). *Islam in Iran* (Islam dar Iran). Translated by Keshavarz, Karim. Tehran, Payam Publication, 1363/ 1984.

PorDawood. Ibrahim. (1388). *Zartosht va Din-e O, Zendagi ve Andish-ye Zarosht: Sayri dar Zendagi ve Amozaha-ye Zartosht* (Zoro-aster and his Riligion, Life and thoughts of Zoroaster, a Survey on Zoroaster's life and Teachings, Vol 3. With the Efforts of Dehbashi, Ali. Afkar Publication.

Photius, Saint. (820-891 BC). *Ctesias of Cnidus* (kholase-ye tarikh-ekatsyas az korosh ta Erdashir marof be kholase-ye fotios). Translated by Kamyab-e Khalili. Tehran, Karang Publication, 1379/2000.

Poornamdaryan, Taghi. (1390/2011). *Sharh o Tafsir-e Dastanha-ye Ramzi Sohraverdi, Aghl-e Sorkh* (The discussion and Interpretation of Mysterical Stories of Sohravardi, the Red Ration). Tehran, Sokhan Pub-lication.

Poulantzas, Nicos. (1978). *State, Power, Socialism*. Translated into English by Patrick Camiller. NLB.

Pirnia. Hasan. (1362/1983). *Tarikh-e Iran-e Bastan* (The History of Ancient Iran). Tehran, Donya-ye Ketab Publication

Pirnia. Hasan. (1383/2004). *Asr-e Asatir-ye Iran. Khotot-e barjasta-ye dastanha-ye ghadim-e iran* (The Mythical Age of Iran. The Prominent Aspects of the Old Stories of Iran, Vol 2). With the Efforts of Izadi, Siroos. Tehran, Hirmand Publication

Pillet, Maurice. (1914). *Kakh-e daruosh-e bozorg dar Shosh* (Le Palais de Daruis ler a Suse). Translated by Khan Malak Yazdi, Mohammad. Tehran, anonymous, 1339/1960.

Prasek, Geschishte. (1906). *der Meder und perser*.

Ranjbar, Sakina. (1381/2002). *Dalayet-e Harakat-e tarikhi-ye Kurd az gharb be Khorasan* (The Reasons Behind the Historical Movements of Kurds to Khorasan). Dangi Kermanj, 1 (1).

Razi, Meskoya. (1376/1997). *Tajarob-ol omam* (The experiences of the nations). Translated by Monzavi, AlinNaghi, vol5. Tehran, Toos Publi-cation.

Russell, James R. (1982). *Zoroastrian Mysticismi* (razveri ve danesh-e nahani dar a'in-e Zartosht). Researched and Translated by Shiva Kavyani. Qoqnoos Publication, 1379/ 2000.

Rawlinson, George. (1898). *A Memoir of Major-Meneral Sir Henery Rawlinson* (safarnamaye Rawlinson. Gozar az zahab be khozestan). Translated by Aman-olahi Baharvand, Sekandar. Tehran, Agah publi-cation, 1362/1983

Rypka, Jan. (1968). *History of Iranian Literature* (tarikh-e adabiyat-e Iran). Translated by Shahabi, Isa. Tehran, ?, 1354/1975.

Raja'ii, Farhang. (1372/1993). *Tahavol-e andisha-ye siasi dar sharq-e bastan* (The development of the Political Thought in the Ancient Ori-ent). Tehran, Qoms Publication.

Rajabi. Parviz. (1380/2000). *Hazareha-ye Gomshode. Jild-e Aval. Zar-tosht, Ahouramazda va Avesta* (The lost Millaniums, vol1: Zoroaster, Ahurmazd and Avesta). Tehran, Toos Publication.

Rostampour, Saloma. (1381/2002). *Mehrparasti dar Iran, hend ve Rom* (Mehrism in Iran, India and Rome). Tehran, KhorshidAfarin.

Reza, Anayat-o alla. (1382/2003). *Aran az dowran-e bastan ta aghaz-e ahd-e maghol* (iran from the Ancient Era up to the beginning of Mon-gol Period). Tehran, The Center for the Documents and research Ser-vices of the Foreign Ministry.

Reza, Anayat-o alla. (1390/2011). *Azarbaijan ve Aran* (Azarbaijan and Aran). Tehran, Nashre Hazar.

Rezaie, AbdulAzim. (1384/2005). *Tarikh-e dah hezar sala-ye Iran* (Ten Thousands Years of Iran History). Tehran, Eghbal Publication, vol16.



- Rezazada Langrodi, Reza. (1384/2005). *Jonbeshha-ye ejtemaie dar Iran pas az Islam* (The Social Movemnts in Iran After Islam). Tehran, nashr-e No
- Razi. Hashem & Khosravani. Hekmat. (1380/2001). *Hekmat Ashraq va Erfan az Zartosht ta Sohravardi* (The Hekmat of Ashragh and Mysti-cism from Zoroaster to Sohravardi). TehrAN, Behjat Publication.
- Razi. Hashem. (1385/2006). *Avesta Kohantarin Ganjina-ye Maktoob Iran, Kitab-e Moghan Vandidad* (Avesta, The Oldest Written Treasure of Iran: The Book of Mages, Vandidad). Tehran, Behjat Publication, vol1.
- Razi. Hashem. (1381/2002). *Ae'in Mehr: Tarikh-e Ae'in RazAmiz Mi-traee dar Shargh va Gharb az Aghaz ta Imrooz* (The ritual of Mithra-ism, The Mysterious History of Mithraism in the Esat and West from the Beginning up to Today, vol 2.
- Ravasani, Shahpour. (1390/2011). *Nehzatha-ye ejtemaie-ye adalatkha-hana dar Iran, GaumateMazdak* (The Justice Seeking Social Move-ments in Iran, Gaumate-Mazdak). Tehran, Chapakhsh.
- Rahbani, Morteza. (1386/2007). *Rohiye-yeIrani rohiye-ye sharghi* (The Iranian Spiritus, The Easter Spiritus). Tehran, ChaPakhsh.
- Ra'isNia, Rahim. (1380/2001). *Azarbaijan dar sair-e tarikh, az aghaz ta Islam, bakhsh-e aval* (Azarbaijan in the Process of History, from Be-ginning to Islam: section1). Tabriz, Nima Publication.
- Ra'isNia, Rahim. (1358/1979). *Tarikh-e omomi-ye mantagh-ye Shervan, dar ahd-e shervanshahian* (The General History of Shervan Region, in the Era of Shervanshahian). Tehran, the Center for the Doc-uments and the History of Diplomacy.
- Rawlinson, George. (1858). *The Histories (of Herodotus) (tavarikh)*. Translated by Vahid-e Mazandarani. Tehran, Donya-ye Kitab Publica-tion, 1368/1989.
- Rostampour, Saloma. (1382/2003). *Mehrparasti der iran, hend ve rom* (Mithraism in Iran, India and Rome). Tehran, Khorshid Afarin Publication.
- Saghiyan, Marzia. (1381/2002). *Jahan-e irani ve toran, majmo'a -ye maghalat* (the Word of Iran and Toran, A Collection of Articles). Teh-ran, The Center for the Publications of Foreign Ministry.
- Sajadi, Hirat. (1381/2002). *Ilal ve ashayer-e Kurdistan* (The Clan and Nomads of Kurdistan). Tehran, bagh-e Now; Sanandaj, Kurdistan University.
- SaqibFar. Morteza. (1377/1998). *Shahnam-ye Ferdawsi va Falsaf-ye Tarikh-e Iran* (The Shahnama of Ferdosi and the Philosophy of Iran History). Tehran, Ghatra- Mo'in Publications.
- Schmidt, Hans-Peter (2006), "Mithra i: Mithra in Old Indian and Mithra in Old Iranian", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, New York: iranica.com (accessed April 2011)
- Skjoervo, Prods oktor. (2011). *light aginst darkness, Dualism in ancient mediterranean religion and the contemporary world*, Armin lange and Eric m. Meyers and ed.vandenhoeck.

Sophocles, (1950). The Theban Plays (afasana-ye tebay). Translated by Shahrokh Maskob. Tehran: Kharazmi. (1352/1973).

Simashko, Morris. (1973). Mazdak (Mazdak). Translated by Mehdi Sa-habi. Tehran, Negah publication, 1387/2008.

Sykes, Sir Percy. (1923). A History of Persia (tarikh-e Iran). Translated by Mohammad Taghiye Fakhrdaei-ye Gilani. Tehran, Afsoon Publica-tion, 1380/2001.

Savory, Roger. (1987). Studies on the History of Safawid Iran (Iran-e asr-e safavi). Translated by Kambiz-e Azizi. Nashr-e Markaz Publica-tion, 1372/1993.

Spuler, Bertold, (1952a). The History of Iran in the Early Islamic Period. Translated by Falatori, Javad. Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publica-tion, 1377/1998.

Schmidt . H. P. (2006). "Mithra i. Mitra in Old Indian and Mithra in Old Iranian. Translated by Saghebfar, Morteza. Tehran: Toos publica-tion, 1385/2006.

Schmitt, R. (1991). The Bistun Inscriptions of Darius the Great, old Persian Text, Corpus inscriptionum iranicarum, I. I. I, London: school of Oriental and African Studies.

Sharp, R.N. (1384/2005). Farmanha-ye Shahanshahi-ye Hakhamaneshi, Jeld-e 2 (The Kingdom commands of Achaemenid, vol2s). Tehran, Pazina ublication.

Shaked, Shaul. (1995). From Zoroastrian Iran to Islam (az iran-e zar-toshti ta isam). Translated by Morteza Saqibfar. Tehran, Qoqnoos publi-cation, 1381/2002.

Shamlo, Ahmad. (1386/2007). Ostora-ye Gilgamesh (the Myth of Gil-gameshh). Tehran, Chesma publication.

Smith, Alfred Goud. (Communication and culture, readings in the codes of human interaction. American Anthropological

Associatio. 1381/2002

Shaki, Mansour. (1985). The Cosmogonical and cosmological Teach-ings of Mazdak (amozaha-ye hasti shenakhti ve takvini-ye ve jahan shenakhti-ye Mazdak). Translated by Manizha Azkaie. Name-ye Parsi, Year 6, No. 3, 1376/1997.

Shahbazi, Shapour. (1350/ 1971). Jahandari-ye koroush-e bozorg (The conquests of the Cyrus the Great). Tehran, Pahlavi University Publica-tion.

Shahbazi, Shapour. (1349/ 1970). Kourosh-e bozorg, zendgi ve ja-handari bonyangozar-e shahanshahi-ye Iran (Cyrus the Great, the Life and Conquests of the Pioneer of the Iran Kingdom). Tehran, Pahlavi University Publication.

Shahrestani, Abu-al Fateh Mohammad Bin-e Abdul Karim (). Almelal ve Nahal (The Nations and the Groups). Translated by Afzadin-e Sadr Taka-ye Esfahani, edited by Said Mohammad Reza jalali Naini. Tehran, Eghbaal Publication, 1350/1371.

Schippmann, Klaus. (1980). Grudzuge der Parthischen Geschichte or The Foundations of Sassanids History (mabani-ye tarikh-e Sasanian). Translated by Kaykaus-e Jahadari. Nashr-e Forozan roz Publication, 1383/2004.

Seddiqi, Gholamhossein. (1372/1993). *Jonbeshha-ye dini-ye Irani dar gharn-e dovom ve sevom-e hejri* (The Iranian Religious Movements in the second and third centuries A.H). Tehran, Pazhang Publication.

Sharp, Norman. (1343/1964). *Farmanha-ye shahanshahan-e hakhamaneshi be zaban-e Arya-ie* (The Mandates of Achamanids Kings in Aryan Language. Shiraz, Shiraz University publication.

Savory, Rojer. M. (1925). *Iran Under Safavids (iran- asr-e safavi)*. Translated by kambiz—e Azizi. Tehran, Nashr-e Markaz Publication, 1382/2003.

Sherratt, Yvonne (2005). *Continental Philosophy of Social Science (falsafa-ye olom-e ejtemaie-ye ghara-ie)*. Translated by Hadi Jalili. Tehran, Nashr-e Nay Publication, 1387.

Safa, Zabiholah. (1384/2005). *Hamase Saraee dar Iran az ghadimitarin ahd-e tarikhi ta gharne chahardahom-e hejri* (Epic Writing in Iran, from the Oldest Historical Time to the 14th century A. H, V: 7). Teh-ran: AmirKabir Publication.

Safizade, farogh. (1385/2006). *adyan-e bastani-ye Iran* (The Anceint religions of Iran). Tehran, Ohadi Publications.

Sophocles. (429B.C). *Theban plays (afsana-ye sofokol*. Translated by Shahrokh-e Maskob. Tehran, Kharazmi Publication, 1385/2006.

Spengler, Oswald. (1933). *Jalhre der Entscheidung, the hour of decision (salha-ye tasmim)*. Translated by Mohammad Bagher-e Hoshyar. Esfahan, Nashre Porsesh Publication, 1377/1998.

Spengler, Oswald. (1928). *The Decline of the West (enhetat-e Gharb)*. Translated by Mehdiye Fadai-ye Mehrbani and Ali-ye Norzad. Tehran, Nashr-e Falat Publication, (Forthcoming)

Spiegel, F. (1887). *Die Artische periode und ihre Zustande, Einzelbeitrage zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden sprachwissenschaft, II, Heft. Leipzig.*

Smith, Cantwell. (1991). *The Meaning and End of Religion*. Fortress Press

Strabo. (1984). *Geography, Books 8-9* (Loeb Classical Library No. 241), Vol. 4, Books 8-9 Edition, by [Strabo](#) (Author), [Horace Leonard Jones](#) (Translator).

Stausberg, Michael. (2008). *Zarathustra and Zoroastrianism: A Short Intro-duction*. London: Equinox Publishing, 2008. p. 20.

Sultani, M. Ali. (1382/2003). *Tarikh-e tahlili-ye Ahl-e Haq* ( The Analytical history f Ahl-e Haq). Tehran, Soha Publication.

Tabani, Habibollah. (1380/2001). *Vahdat-e ghomi-ye Kurd ve Mad* (The Ethnic Unity of Kurd and Mede). Tehran, Gostarda Publication.

Terner, Brayan, S. (1998). *MaxWeber and Islam (Maks veber ve Islam)*. Translated by Sa'ide Vesali. Tehran, Nashr-e Markaz Publication, 1379/2000.

Tafazoli. Ahmad. (1376/1997). *Tarikh-e Adabiat Iran Pish az Islam* (The History of Iran Literature Before Islam). Tehran, Sokhan Publica-tion.

Taheri, Abolghasem. (1349/1970). Tarikh-e siasi ve ejtemaie-ye iran az marg-e Taimour ta marg-e Shah Abbas (The Political and Social History of Iran from the death of Taimour to the Death of Shah Abbas). Tehran, Habibi Publication, 1380/2001.

Tabatabaie, Javad. (1380/2001). Dibacha-ie bar nazarya-ye enhetat-e Iran (A Preface on the Theory of Iran Decline). Tehran, Negah-e Moaser Publication.

Tabatabaie, Javad. (1379/2000). Khaje nizam-al Molk ve tadavom-e andisha-ye Iranshahri (Khaje Nizam-al Molk and the thought of the Greater Iran). Tehran, n.p.

طبری، محمد بن جریر. تاریخ طبری (تاریخ الرسل و الملوك). ترجمه ابوالقاسم پاینده. انتشارات بنیاد فرهنگ ایران، 1352، چاپ دوم [انتشارات اساطیر](#)، 1365 تاریخ طبری (تاریخ الرسل و الملوك) با مقدمه ابوالفضل ابراهیم، ترجمه صادق نشأت تهران، بنگاه □ ترجمه و نشر کتاب، 1351

Tabari, Ehsan. (1348/1969). Mazdak-e bamdadān, barrasiha-ie dar ba-ra-ye jahanbiniha ve jonbesh-e ejtemai-ye Iran (Mazad of Bamdadān, Surveys on the Worldviews and Social Movements of Iran). Tehran, n. p.

Thieme, Paul (1960), "The 'Aryan' Gods of the Mitanni Treaties", Journal of the American Oriental Society 80.4. pp. 301–317.

Thomson, J. Oliver. (1948). History of Ancient Geography. Cambridge University Press.

Togan, Ahmed Zeki Velidi. (1970). Umumi Turk tarihine giris (The Beginning of the History of Turk nation). Istanbul.

- Ulansey, David (1991). Origins of the Mithraic Mysteries. New York: Oxford UP. p.

94. ISBN 0-19-506788-6.s

Van Bruinessen, Martin. (1992). Agha, Shaikh and State: The Social and Political Structures of Kurdistan (Agha, shaikh ve dowlāt: saxtar-e ejtemaie ve siasi-ye Kurdistan). Treanslated by Ebrahim-e Yonesi. Teh-ran, Paniz Publication, 1378/1999.

Vandenberghe, Louis. (1969). Archéologie de l'Iran Ancien (bastans-henasi-ye iran-e bastan). Translated by Isa Behnam. Tehran, Tehran University Press, 1348/1969.

Vermaseren, M. (1963). The Ritual of Mithra (Ayien Mitra). Translated by Bozorg Naderzad. Tehran, Dehkhoda Bookstore, 1345/1966.

Vermaseren, M. J. (2011). "The miraculous Birth of Mithras". In László Gerevich. Studia Archaeologica. Brill. pp. 93–109. Retrieved 4 Octo-ber 2011.

Vermaseren, M. J. (1956), Corpus inscriptionum et monumentorum religionis mithriacae, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, CIMRM 29, Head of a beardless Mithras in Phrygian cap, point of which is missing.

Vincent, Joan (1994) 'On Law and Hegemonic Moments: Looking behind Law in Early Modern Uganda, in Susan Hirsch and Mindie Lazarus-Black (eds) Contested States: Law, Hegemony and Resistance. London : Routledge.

Vogelsang, W. J. (1992). *The Rise and Organisation of the Achaemenid Empire: The Eastern Iranian Evidence*, Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Waters, Matthew. (2011). *Note on the medes And their Empier*, University of Wisconsin, EAU Claire, ISBN 978193430937

- Weber, Max. (1965). *The sociology of Religion* London.s

Wherry, Rev. E. M. (1882). *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran comprising Sale's translation and Preliminary Discourse*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. p. 66.

Wolfgang, K. (1975). *Das altiranische furstenidesl von xenophon bis Ferdousi*. (Arman-e shahriyari der irane bastan). Translated by Saifadin-e Najm Abadi. Tehran, The Ministry of culture and Art Press, 1355/1976.

Widengren, G. (1968). *Religions de l'Iran (Dinha-ye Iran vol1)* Trans: Manoochehr-e Farhang. Tehran: Agahin Ide, 1377/1998.

Widengren, G, *Acta Iranica*, I, 1974

Wiesehofer, Josef. (2001). *Ancient Persia (iran-e bastan az 500 B.C to 650 A.C)*. Translated by Morteza Saqibfar. Tehran, Qoqnoos Publication, 1377/1998.

Wiesehofer, Josef. (1978). *Der Aufstand Gaumatas und die Anfange Dareios 1 (Ghiam-e Gomata ve aghaz-e padeshahi-ye darioush-e avel)*. Translated by Hoshang-e Sedeghi. Tehran, Ama Publication, 1389/2010.

Xenophon. (). *Anabasis or the Persian Expedition (bazgasht az iran)*. Translated by Manoochehre Amiri. Tehran, Scientific Cultural Publication, 1373/1994.

Xenophon. (n. d). *The Education of Cyrus (tarbiat-e kourosh)*. Translated by Bahman-e Karimi. Tehran, Egbal Publication, 1350/1971.

Yarshater, Ehsan (2006). "IRAN ii. IRANIAN HISTORY (2) Islamic period". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. ۱۲ (1st ed.). New York: Bibliotheca Persica Press. p. ۲۲۷. ISBN 978-0-933273-96-2.

Yarshater, Ehsan. (1371/1992). *Dar jostojo-ye raz-e bagha: mas'ala-ye rastakhiz-e farhang-ye Khorasan (In serach of the Secrets of Survival: The Issue of Cultural Resurrection of Khorasan)*. Tehran, Scientific-cultural Publication Co.

Yarshater, Ehsan. (1982). *Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. III: Seleucid, Parthian and Sassanian Periods (ed.)*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Yarshater, Ehsan. (1983). *Cambridge history of Iran: The Seleucid, Parthian and Sasanian periods 2*. pp. 995–997. ISBN 978-0-521-24693-4.

Yamauchi, A. M. (1937). *Persia and the Bible (Iran ve Adian-e Bas-tani)*. Translated by Manoochehr-e Pezeshk. Tehran, Ghoghnoos Publication, 1390/2011.

Yamauchi, Edwin M (2007), cited in Lee Strobel, *The Case for the Real Jesus*, Grand Rapids: MI: Zondervan

Young, T. C, Jr. and Others. (1385/2006). *Iran-e bastan, pisha tarikh: Ilamian, Hakhamaneshian, Selokian, Parthian, Sasanian (The Ancient Iran, Prehistory: Elamites, Acaemanids, Seleucids,*

Parthians and Sas-anians). Translated and Compiled by Yaghob Azand. Tehran, Moly Publication.

[Yūsufi, Ġ. H](#) (1387/2008). "ABŪ MOSLEM, Sardar-e ( the Commandar of ) KŌRĀSĀN". Tehran, Scientific-Cultural Publication.

Zarinkob. Abdolhosein. (1384/2005). Tarikh-e Mardom-e Iran, az payan-e sasanian ta al-e boye (The History of Iran People, from the End od Sassanids up to Al-e Boye). Tehran, Amirkabir Publication.

Zarinkob. Abdolhosein. (1378/1999). Du qarn sukut (Two Centuries of Silemce), Tehran, Sokhan Publication.

Zarinkob. Abdolhosein. (1368/1989). Rozgaran: Tarikh-e Iran az aghaz ta soghot-e Pahlavi (The Times: the History of Iran from Beginning to the Downfall of Pahlavi). Tehran: Nashr-e Sokhan Publication.

Zeki, Mohammad Emin. (1931). A Historical research about Kurd and Kurdistan (tahghighi tarikhi der bara-ye Kurd ve Kurdistan). Translated by tabani, habibollah. Tehran, Aidin Publication, 1377/1998.

Zomorodi, Homaira. (1382/2003). Naghd-e tatbighi-ye adyan ve asatir dar shahnama-ye Ferdosi, Khamsa-ye Nezami ve manteghotair-e Atar (A Comparative Criticism of the religions and the Myths in Ferdowsi's Shahnama, Nezami's Khamsa and Atar's Mantegh-o- Tai). Tehran, Zovar Publication.

Zaehner, R. C. (1956). The Teachings of the Magi, A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs (ta'alim-e Moghan, gotari chand dar mo'taghedat-e zartoshtian. Translated by Faraidon-e Badraie. Tehran, Toos publication, 1377/1998.

Ziapour, Jalil. (1355/1976). madha ve bonyangozari-ye nokhostin shahanshahi dar gharb-e falat-e Iran (The Medes and Pioneering the First kingdom in the West of Iran Plateau). Tehran, National Works Association Pub-lication.

Zumerchik, J. and Steven Laurence Danver (2010). Seas and Waterways of the World: An Encyclopedia, uses and Issues. ABC-CLIO.